SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): Sir, with your permission, I want to associate myself with this Special Mention. It is a very serious situation and the Central Government should not delay it any further.

Plight of Workers of Sawai Madhopur (Rajasthan) Cement Factory

डा० अबरार अहमद खान (राजस्थान) : महोदय, मैं इस विशेष उल्लेख के माध्यम से राजस्थान में सवाई माधोपुर के अन्दर गत 21 महीनों से बंद पड़ी सीमेंट फैक्ट्री की ओर सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं । वहां पर पांच हजार श्रमिक, उनके घरों के 25 हजार सदस्य तथा सवाई माधोपुर की इकनोमी इस एशिया की सबसे बडी कही जाने वाली सीमेंट फैक्ट्री पर आधारित थी । लेकिन पिछले 21 महीनों से यह सीमेंट फैक्ट्री बंद पड़ी हुई है । वहां के मजदूर भूखों मर रहे हैं । पहनने के लिये उनके पास कपड़े नहीं हैं, उनके बच्चे शिक्षा के लिये स्कूलों में नहीं जा सकते, उनका सारा सामान बिक चुका है । मैंने पहले भी विशेष उल्लेख के माध्यम से सरकार से इस बात का आग्रह किया था । लेकिन बराबर मेरे पास यह जवाब आया कि यह मामला बी०ए०एफ०आर० के पास है । अभी-अभी बी०ए०एफ०आर० की बैठक हुई और उसके अंदर यह फैसला किया गया कि 5 अप्रैल को यह फैक्ट्री बंद कर दी जायेगी । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से आग्रह करना चाहता हूं कि यह फैक्ट्री बंद न हो, इसके लिये सरकार इंटरवीन करे और केंद्रीय सरकार इसमें मदद करे और राज्य सरकार को निर्देश दे कि वह फैक्ट्री को बंद न करे । इसके लिये यह उसको ग्रांट दे ताकि यह फैक्ट्री चल सके । आज वहां पर 25 हजार आदमी भूखों मर रहे हैं । सवाई माधोपुर में ये लोग बहुत बुरी हालत में हैं । वे भूखों मर रहे हैं, उनके बच्चे स्कूलों में नहीं जा रहे है और उनके तन पर कपड़े नहीं हैं उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि यह सीमेंट फैक्ट्री नहीं चलेगी तो सवाई माधोपुर की सारी एकनामी जो है वह डगमगा जायेगी और वहां पर 25 हजार आदमी बेघरबार हो जायेंगे । वे भूखों मर रहे हैं । इसलिये मैं आपके माध्यम से भारत सरकार से अनुरोध करूंगा कि भारत सरकार इस समस्या का हल निकाले और इस फैक्ट्री को चलवाने के लिये जो भी संभव उपाय हो सकते हैं वह करे । वह राज्य सरकार को इस संबध में निर्देश दे और बैंक गारंटी देने की व्यवस्था करवाये अथवा केंद्र सरकार इस फैक्ट्री का राष्ट्रीयकरण करे और चाहे किसी भी तरह से करे लेकिन इस समस्या का हल निकाले ।

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—(Contd).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): The House will continue now with the discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is with some relief that I observe that the Treasury benches are empty; that all the benches are empty. But it is with some concern that I have to point out and I hold my colleague, the hon. Minister Shri Ram Niwasji Mirdha in the highest personal and parochial esteem—that I would have expected, Sir, that at least in as important a discussion as this debate on the President's Address, the Cabinet would be better represented. I am sure Shri Ram Niwasji Mirdha represents the Cabinet, in his personal capacity adequately but I am not sufficiently convinced that the points or the absence of points that I might wish to contribute would be communicated by him to the Prime Minister. I don't think he can get an audience with the Prime Minister firstly. And, secondly, the Prime Minister, I am given to understand, is away in Maharashtra. By the time he returns and given his working style, we do feel somewhat cheated that the Cabinet is as inadequately represented as it is just now. Having said that, I would like to

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

clarify that have 32 minutes of the allotted time.

Sir, as we resume this interrupted discussion on the President's Address to the Parliament, I would wish to share with my colleagues, both on this side and on the Treasury benches, some very deeply-felt concerns about the unhappy events of the past few days. It does not require my underlining that the boycott by the entire Opposition, of the presentation of the Union Budget, for the first time ever in our independent history, is an event of the most exceptional seriousness. Sir, it is not for me to comment on the conduct of others. If I, nevertheless, do express a concern, it is about the role and function of Parliament in providing the necessary leadership to the nation, and in educating public opinion about the great issues of the day. Sir, in this context I would like to share with the House what Walter Begehot, a very great constitutionalist had to say about the teaching task of such assemblies. He said that "the greatest teacher of all in Parliament, the great elevator of the country, in so far as Parliament elevates, must be the Prime Minister. He has an influence and authority, a facility, in giving a great tone or a mean tone to discussions wihin the Parliament which no other MP has." That is why, Sir, it is a matter of such great disappointment to me that the leader of this Government, and the principal servant of the Parliament, has chosen to interpret his task, and his responsibility, in a manner that finds voice in a mean tone. It is deeply troubling to us this na-na style of conducting the affairs of State. I am, Sir, profoundly disturbed by the smallness of the field of awareness of this Government; by the by now obvious triviality of the leadership of it, and of the pettiness of the leader's thought, by his demeanour: of the near total absence of the inspirational, and the inspiring, in his persuasions this repeated demonstration of a kind of low malice in the tone and content of his political debate; this tendency to hit low, this preoccupation with puerile jibes, with the sub-surfacial texture of our land, not with the vividity and wonder of it, or of its great people. That is why, Sir, we search for precisely that vision, about which the President's address to the Parliament so emptily speaks. Instead we find this unworthy caricature of a Government, prone to belittling and to trivialising, to tittering on the most sacred of occassions, in the holiest of places—and in the face of the gravest of tragedies.

It became my sad duty and necessary for me to refer to this sorry episode, and, to all this, only because the President's Address to the Parliament is like an account of the State of the Union and Sir, the state of the union is deeply unhappy—there has been an erosion in the moral authority of Government as never before—There is, indeed, an erosion of politicians whether on the Treasury benches or those that sit with me, of the entire ilk of politicians, indeed of the ennobling calling of politics—as public service as such. There is, Sir, an evaporation of the credibility and functional efficiency of our institutions as never before seen since independence. I am constrained and saddened to say that our State has been usurped as it were by the worst kind of cronyism and by cronies.

For one thing, however, and one thing alone, if credit is due to this Government, it is for the drafting of the President's Address: A document of singularly shoddy speech writing, with complicated syntex, structures and recurringly defective grammar. In the Address of the President to the Parliament we look for, Sir, and search for the most lucid and the most ennobling of prose, instead of which our Government delivers in his hands a document which I can only call a threadbare old wardrobe of lost illusions. And if credit is due to the

Government, it is certainly for the drafting of that Address and only that.

Sir I wish to make my intervention on three principal points. The internal, briefly the economic, and then the external. In the internal, I was struck by the irony of its tone. I do not know whether the Cabinet, when it deliberated upon the Address of the President, or did it deliberate upon it? and whether the Cabinet also reflected on the inbuilt inherent irony of a sentence that is used by the President in his Address to the Parliament that the nation is in much greater harmony with itself. I was struck equally by another sentence; for harping back by this Government on the massive mandate—indeed a massive mandate—that had been granted to it four years ago. In referring to that mandate now is a reminder of it having turned into ashes. When I look for this harmony to which the President refers, I do not find it in Punjab, and it is not here necessary for me because we will have different occasions to refer again to Punjab and the continuing trauma and the continuing tragedy of Punjab. I do not find it in Assam; I do not find it through the great heartland of our country; I do not find it Sir, from where you come and so honourably, and so wonderfully, represent your part in this Parliament. I am distressed that senior Members of Parliament from Assam should have been persuaded enough to charge the Union Home minister with having incited near secessionist trouble within the State of Assam. I accept that the Union Home minister has denied it; but the fact that the Union Home minister has been charged with such a thing, or the fact that the Union Home Minister should go to the extent of saying that State Governments are misemploying the police and are dressing them up in the uniforms of Central forces, like the Border Security Force or the CRPF etc., are not signs of the nation being in harmony with itself.

One of the principal subscriptions to which all of us, to which we all; subscribe is about secularism, about separating religion from politics, and the President's Address makes a reference to it and says that the Government has moved actively towards achieving separation of religion from politics. I am not persuaded, because it is a subjective viewpoint, and I am not persuaded because here is what a Congress Chief Minister, in an interview, has said to the press. "What made you so confident of winning?" "Victory was quite obvious. Laldenga had gone against Christian principles. He criticised the church and challenged its leaders. This is not just our victory; it is a victory of the church." Sir, I have the highest regard and I am deeply moved as an individual as a person, by the tenets of Christianity or by the great sayings of Christ. It is, however, my understanding that whatever my personal faith, persuasion or belief be, the whole purpose of separating religion from politics is nullified if church and State are equated in the fashion that a Congress Chief Minister has done. I have had the good fortune of having spent a great deal of my time, in various capacities, not just as Member of this House or a political activist, but in various other capacities in the North-East of India. Some of the most beautiful Indians come from the North-East. If I have mentioned this point, it is not to belittle their faith, or their subscription to their faith, or the fact that they find inspiration from that faith. It is to point out that the Government speaks with a forked tongue when it talks on the one hand, of separating religion from politics, and on the other when its own Chief Minister speaks of the confluence of church and the State. If you do this and if you permit this to happen in one part of India, no matter how small or big, then you lose the moral authority, the moral right to call into question when my friend, my gallant colleague, General Jagjit Singh

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

Aurora tomorrow says that the gurudwara and State are inseparable. I have often found difficulty with accepting the fact that the Akali Dal should accept, or the Akali Dal should be subservient to the SGPC. In the face of its acceptance, in one part of India, you cannot impose it in another because you lose the moral authority for that. Sir, I am constrained, in this very context, to give yet another example, which is an example of a member of the coalition Government, in which the ruling party is a member: the coalition Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. In the face of the unhappy events following upon banning of Satanic Verses by Salman Rushdie—and I appreciate that a great many of those that follow the Islamic faith are deeply troubled by the contents of that book; I obtained it but I was unable to read it....

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Can you lend me that book?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Normally, I do not lend books. I am conscious that a great many of my countrymen who follow the Islamic faith have found the contents of Salman Rushdie's book deeply troubling, but in the wake of that medieval Islamic fatva, as it is given from other sources and another country, a member of this coalition Government in Jammu and Kashmir, of which this ruling party is a coalition member, stood up and said, in criticism of a statement by the General Secretary of the ruling party, that "this is not a problem with which anyone else, who is not a Muslim, should be concerned, that this is our concern." Now, Sir, I plead with the Government that you take note of these things because when you speak with insufficient conviction, that is when the Government's speech becomes that of a forked tongue.

[**The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. Satyanarayan Reddy)** in the Chair.]

I noted with a great deal of concern that in this entire Address there is no mention of the rampant cancer of corruption. I cannot attribute this absence, of its omission from the President's speech to amnesia. I can only attribute it to the Government deliberately having chosen not to refer to corruption, rampant in the country. I am unable to understand why the Government is so choosy because, irrespective of what might or might not come about from the investigations that the Government had launched, an impression has gone round the nation that following upon the scandals of Bofors, HDW submarines and Lalit Suri, various other film actors and the cronies of the ruling family, corruption is no longer an issue that you need to bother about. It is because of this that today in almost every single village of the country corruption is rampant, every single patwari and thanedar considers it his birthright to demand money, from the citizens as if corruption is no longer an issue. And if it is because of that persuasion that the Government has not included corruption in the President's Address, then and only then will there be sufficient explanation called for.

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): Corruption has been nationalised.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would refer very briefly to the economic aspect of the President's Address because we would have different occasions to make a mention of it, and in detail. There will be a debate on the budget, but I would like to say that on the economic front there is a very omnious and long shadow of debt that looms large on the country. I would also like to refer to the fact that our balance of payments position is extremely difficult, that our debt servicing ratio has crossed over 24 per cent, though the World Bank estimates are at 26 per cent; that the savings

rate has gone down, that the "pressure points" are not just on the savings rate but on the balance of payments and prices also. We have come to a situation wherein interest on internal public borrowing has become the largest single head of expenditure in the Union budget, it has crossed 17,000 crores. I refer to the economy, in the sense, that the recovery that
2.00 P.M. the nation has had and the national economy has displayed has itself brought into focus some of the major weaknesses and the macro economic imbalances that plague our economy. I would like to say that the recovery has had no impact on those marco economic imbalances because this upturn in our economy is largely monsoon-based.

I now come to the third part of my intervention, which is about our external relations. Paying particular attention to this portion of the Address which deals with our external relations and with our foreign policy, I was struck by the almost dream-world contents of the Address, by the tendency of our Government to be always confused when confronted with issues of defence and foreign policy, by its characteristics of treating diagnosis itself as the remedy, by confusing attitude, individual or otherwise, as policy, and confusing style for substance. I was also struck, Sir, by the near total absence of a macroscopic vision of a role for India in a rapidly transforming world, when we have to re-establish and re-discover a new relevance for non-alignment. Even as the sharply combative outlines of super power blocks dissolve, our Government is content to worship in yesterday's temples. A backward look, a microscopic eye, focussed on the attainments of yesterday, is no guide; it cannot be a guide for tomorrow. And that, Sir is the single greatest conceptual failing in the portion of the President's Address that it deals with our external relations.

In the Address itself, at a place, the President has been good enough to mention that peace has been maintained on our borders. Again I was struck by the ironical inaccuracy of it. On an average, in a week, there are five casualties from Siachin. On an average, in a week, there are 15 casualties from Sri Lanka. When we are talking of having maintained peace on our borders, have we forgotten that Siachin constitutes a part of India, or that IPKF's presence in Sri Lanka constitutes a part of our borders?

I was also struck by the presumption contained in the Address which says that the Delhi Declaration has *somehow persuaded the super powers* to take the stand that they have done. It merits a much more detailed examination perhaps, and as we go along in this long Session, perhaps we will get a chance to examine the Government's foreign policy and will do so. On the specific aspects where I will seek clarifications from the Government, I have four or five broad points.

Firstly, the visit to China. This has been eulogisde, and has been described variously in competitively high tones and in superlatives. In this context I am reminded of an Aristotelian piece of wisdom 'that plausible impossibility is better than impossible plausibility.' The President's Address describes our relations with the Peoples Republic of China as never having been 'better in a generation.' I have consistently and constantly advocated improvement of relations. I welcome all normalisation, settlement of disputes, resolution of all contentions and I stand for peace with neighbours and in neighbourhood. But the central question is peace on the borders and in the neighbourhood, how and at what cost? My specific questions therefore, on the Prime Minister's visit to the Peoples Rupublic of China are: Firstly, does the Government of India consider the settlement of the territorial dispute, the boundary dispute, with the peo-

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

ple's Republic of China as Central to normalization of relations, or does it not consider that as such? Because, implicit in the Prime Minister's visit to the People's Republic of China, and the description of our relations as contained in the President's Address as "never having been better in a generation", is the fact that this is without settlement—the territorial dispute—and, if we have relations which are better than they have been in the last generation or so, then have we not conceded the central core of our stand which successive Governments of India have adhered to, that before real normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China can take place there ought to be a settlement of the territorial and boundary dispute? The stand of the People's Republic of China has been the very obverse of it and, therefore, if the Prime Minister has gone and made this visit, in diplomatic terms has he, therefore, not conceded to the People's Republic of China the most important point that they wanted as a concession from India? The Government of India must explain this point because, even though we stand for normalization of relations, it is not peace at any cost.

My second clarification on this visit to the People's Republic of China starts from this statement in the President's Address which says that "A joint Working Group is being set up to consider measures for resolving the boundary question in a fair, reasonable and mutually acceptable manner." No problem can be resolved unless it is mutually acceptable. Therefore, this phrase "mutually acceptable", is, of course, redundant. However, two questions on this: Has the principle of settlement of the territorial or boundary dispute been identified? If the principle has been identified, has it been agreed upon between the People's Republic of China and our country and, if it has been agreed upon, then, what is that principle? Further, why have you shifted—because in diplomatic parlance every choice of word has a meaning—from "just and reasonable" to "fair and reasonable?" Is that also not a concession to the People's Republic of China, because that has been their pharaseology?

Thirdly, Sir, the honourable Prime Minister, before his visit to the People's Republic of China, had said that the boundary dispute be settled in a "reasonable time-frame." This "reasonable time frame" has been omitted altogether from whatever pronouncements were issued during or after the visit. Does it mean that the Government of India has now given up the solution of our territorial dispute with the People's Republic of China within a "reasonable time-frame?"

Then, Sir, there are referenecs to the revival of *Panch Sheel*. I was struck by the deep irony of it, because *Panch Sheel* actually died a premature death on the bleak heights of the Aksai Chin which, precisely, was in dispute, in 1962. In the revival of *Panch Sheel* what are they trying to revive? We cannot breathe life into a body that is dead. I would, therefore, like the Government to explain to us this reiteration of yesterday's icons, the re-worshipping of yesterday's *murtis*, because this cannot be an alternative for policy.

I need a further clarification on the concept of joint Working Group. A joint Working Group between the People's Republic of China and us can be joined, or joint, only if there is a prior, an existing, and an accepted principle which joins it, which unites it, functionally motivates it. Then, how is this Working Group to be joint without the principle having been enunciated and, if it is not so jointed, then what were the earlier eight rounds of talks? Where they disjoinde or disjointed? Sir, is this therefore, not an attempt by the Government to make a distinction where actually no difference exists? The Government must explain this point to us and convince us about it.

I would turn to four other aspects of the Prime Minister's visit to the People's Republic.

First, Sir, there was not a single mention by the Prime Minister in his private conversations or otherwise, of the aspect of the continuing Sino-Pak military and nuclear co-operation. If the Prime Minister mentioned it during his visit to the Peoples Republic of China, then, he must inform us about it; to whom he mentioned it and with what results. If he did not mention it, then too, Sir, we have a right to know why did he not mention it? The Prime Minister, in one of his characteristic interventions earlier, once mentioned that the previous governments 'did not have the guts' to mention something about non-alignment or Commonwealth or whatever. I would not like to refer to the mid-riff of the Prime Minister—but nevertheless, I would like to be informed, because if there is some security problem, than is the concern of all of us, and if that was not mentioned by the Prime Minister in what was, no doubt, his first visit in so many decades—then why was it not so mentioned? The Parliament has a right to know.

Secondly, Sir, in this very House, in clarification to a question I had asked, this Government had informed me that the Chinese establishment of a post in Sumdorong Chu was the establishment of a post on 'Indian territory.' I would like to know from the Government: Did it ask for a clarification on the continuation of that post in Sumdorong Chu, even while the talks were going on, and if he asked for that clarification, what was the response from the People Republic of China? And if he did not ask for a clarification, is it beacuse the Prime Minister too suffers from the same debility that he so imaginatively and wrongly attributes to his political adversities?

Thirdly, Sir, there was a reference to Tibet which is deeply painful to me. On Tibet, firstly, gratuitously, almost a subservient reference was made upon the insistence of the People's Republic of China. It is not sufficient to say that in making that refernec the Government of India has merely reiterated its earlier position. Sir, that reiteration is misleading because that first stand of the Government, on the issue of Tibet, took place when there was no issue of Sikkim. The People's Republic of China is yet to recognise us in Sikkim, till date, officially. Why did the Prime Minister gratuitously grant to the People's Republic of China what it wanted when we are not recognised till date by the PRC? This Parliament has the right to know, and I have a right to demand an answer from the Prime Minister.

I go to the next visit of the Prime Minister to which a refernece has been made—that is his visit during the SAARC Conference to Pakistan. Sir, yet again I would like to mention that I welcome normalisation. But I would like to make a distinction between attitudes and policies. If the attitude of the Prime Minister of Pakistan is welcome, if the attitude of the Prime Minister of Pakistan is wholesome, it does not necessarily mean, in diplomacy, that that attitude is policy. There is a great divide between substance and style, which is what this Government is failing to comprehend. Therefore, I want to specific clarification: I asked the hon. Minister of External Affairs, the other day, and in the process of reply he said:

"एक नयी फिजा बनी है, पाकिस्तान के साथ"

The very next day, Sir, the hon. Minister for Home Affairs, Buta Singhji, in reply to another question, directly accused the Government of Pakistan of continuing to encourage terrorism in India. I would, therefore, like the Government to inform us: Is the Union Home Minister right or the Union Minister of External Affairs right? If there is a new *fizan*, what is that new *fizan*?

Secondly, we have concluded a protocol for non-attack on each other's

nuclear installations. In clarification, when I asked it the Minister of External Affairs said that this protocol "does not foreclose any options.' What this protocal has done is precisely that, it has foreclosed options. And secondly, it has granted to Pakistan strategic parity in a field which has been the policy of successive Governments of India to deny. Why does the Government of India, not therefore, come forward and say that this is our policy? Why does it obfuscate the issue when the Union Minster of External Affairs says that it does not foreclose our options? Would the Government and the Prime Minister clarify, if despite having signed the protocol on the non-attack of each other's nuclear installations, no option is foreclosed, then is that protocol worth the piece of paper that it has been signed on? In this context I am totally unable to comprehend what the Government of India's policy is. This is the proper occasion and the Prime Minister must explain it rationally, reasonably and coolly.

On the question of Sri Lanka, Sir, would speak very briefly, that we are in a bind. We would be mistaken if we consider that with the holding of the Presidential elections and other Parliamentary elections in Sri Lanka, the continuing dilemma in which our Indo-Sri Lanka policy is bound is somehow resolved. To put it simply,

We are in a situation wherein the IPKF cannot be withdrawn, because if it is withdrawn and if the Sri Lankan army, which is by now about there divisions strong, starts doing in Jaffna what we have been doing, then we have lost our option of telling the Sri Lankan Army, or telling the Sri Lankan Government that they cannot do this in Jaffna. Secondly, having withdrawn the IPKF, we cannot re-introduce it. Thirdly, we cannot continue to be there because nobody wants us to be there. Fourthly, if the IPKF is withdrawn—I am given to understand that with the EROS having publicly stated that they shall not take their oath—this whole edifice that has been created shall crumble. I am, therefore, unable to understand. Are we committed to a policy of IPKF's perpetual commitment and perpetual presence in Sri Lanka? The Government must spell this out, because the continuous presence of the IPKF in Sri Lanka is not only an Indo-Sri Lankan difficulty, but its presence itself directly affects our security concerns. It is a difficulty that does cast a shadow on our bilateral relations with all our neighbourhood.

Sir, I would like to clarify a misimpression that the Prime Minister seems to be nursing. He has stated that a criticism of the Governmnet, when it engages the armed forces in any action, is a criticism of the armed forces. It is not for the Prime Minister to inform me personally, or my gallant colleague, Gen. Jagjit Sing Aurora, as to how the armed forces behave what motivates the armed forecs, or what lowers their morale. Let this fact be understood that the commitment of our armed forces, in any role, and on any task, is a political decision that is taken. And it is our right, as Members of Parliament, to every time, whenever we are so disturbed, and whenever we are so persuaded, to call into question that political decision-making. If in the process, the Prime Minister chooses to confuse the criticism of political decision-making with the criticism of the armed forces themselves, then he is doing a dis-service, not we, who ask and call into question the political decision-making.

I would like to mention here that the armed forces do not take it as a great compliment when you say that the operations in Maldives were a feat of arms. I am sure my colleague, Gen. Jagjit Singh Aurora, will bear witness with me—against a ragtag band of 200 and odd mercenaries, ill-led and iller-motivated, the might of the Indian Armed Forces had to demonstrate itself. I, therefore, beseech the Government not to use a Polaris missile to crack a pistachio. You don't have to engage in hyper-

bole to convince the armed forces that they are performing well. Maldives is a bad example of it. Why don't you talk of their great sacrifices and their continuing great sacrifices; in fighting in the most inhospitable terrain in the world, in Siachin? Why don't we hear about the Siachin because Siachen is a disturbing question. However, I shall let that pass because I have no time and I want to concentrate on just two other points.

Firstly, about Afghanistan, I do make bold to make a comment here that the Government of India's Afghanistan policy since 1980 will have long-term historical consequences for India, which would be as troublesome, and as consequential as our policy in Tibet was. I would like to share a thought with my much wiser colleague, Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha that mistakes on domestic policy are easily corrected. The Government can corret them. They can be rectified, but if you make a mistake in foreign policy determination, it is generations that suffer, and I don't have to give the examples of Jammu and Kashmir or of our China policy, or of Tibet to illustrate the point. And in like fashion, I do say that the policy that we are pursuing in Afghanistan will haunt us for generations to come. Why do I say so? Because we are in a trap; in a situation where in an ancient and time-honoured ally, the Afghan people, are today disenchanted with us. I say what I have said because we are in another trap—the Government's Afghan policy is in a trap; in a situation of no options. I cannot understand, Sir, why the Government of India chose to identify its policy, in Afghanistan, with the personality of President Najibullah. I can understand that they wanted to stand by the PDPA, but when the Soviet Union itself is abandoning its allies of yesterday, I am totally at sea to understand why the Government of India found it necessary to jump the queue and make President Najibullah the very embodiment of our Afghan policy.

Sir, I would, in this context, like to have an official contradiction from the Government. Reports have appeared in Xinhua, which is an official news agency of the People's Republic of China, which is again an index of the improvement of relations with the PRC as never before in a decade or a generation, reports have appeared of the presence of Indian nationals in Afghanistan, in roles which is not the stated or the declared policy of the Government of India. It is very necessary that before further mischief is caused and further damage is done to India's standing on the total Afghan question, this matter is officially denied.

I am very disturbed about the continuing situation of the exodus of minorities from Bangladesh. I am further distressed that the Government of India and the President's Address is totally silent on it. The Government of West Bengal, and the Government of Assam, have already, officially and formally, communicated their difficulties to the Government of India, that the present inflow of people from Bangladesh is in unprecedented numbers and is causing us a great problem. Why is there not a mention of this in this President's Address? What has the Government of India been doing about it to cure this because this will cause us many problems, deeply troubling, social, economic and political.

Sir, I was distressed that during the recent visit of the Australian Prime Minister, no mention was made either of Fiji or the role that the Australian Government is playing in Fiji, in perpetuating what is a racist regime, which even the Commonwealth calls it as a racist regime, and which Australia is now supporting and during the visit of the Australian Prime Minister, in detriment to the interests of the Indian settlers in Fiji, why did the Government of India not mention this fact and bring up this matter

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

before the Prime Minister of Australia?

I must conclude now. One can go on endlessly. You have been very patient and the hon. Minister has been very considerate. I hold no hopes that the points that I have raised will be answered in the reply by the Prime Minister. Nevertheless, I consider it my duty and function to raise them. Sir, this Address which is an annual ritual and which has been my privilege to hear for almost a decade was particularly disappointing. It was unilluminating and it was if I might say so, as dilapidated in impression as is the demeanour of this Government. It was a somewhat breathless and imaginary account of what our Government's assumptions are. No shortcomings are indicated in this address, no difficulties, whatsoever, are enumerated in this address. There is no assignment of blame, to anyone except to the predictable quarter of the disaffected, in which we in the Opposition as political adversaries of the Treasury Benches are listed. There is, Sir, in all this a mountainous cloud of vipour and wool, of questionable statistics, boring travel itinerary of various dignitaries, reading more like a tavel agency's brochure than actually the attainments of our Government, oblique justification of difficulties, of extenuating circumstances for gross failures, elaborate charade of complex and unconvincing alibis and in all of it, in the entire length of the Address, there is not a single word of concern, of anxiety, of national responsibility; and all this is taking place when there is in the gravest, and perhaps, the most serious erosion of the moral authority of the Government of India. That is why, Sir, I find it difficult to support the Motion of my colleague, Mr. P. N. Sukul, who has moved it and I am grateful to you, Sir, for giving me a patient hearing. Thank you.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के लिए धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव यहां प्रस्तुत किया गया है मैं अपने को उससे सहमत नहीं पा रहा हूं । मैं उसका विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं ।

जो राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण है वह लग रहा है कि बिल्कुल ही दिशाहीन है । जिस गहराई से संकट से देश गुजर रहा है, हमारा देश विदेशी कर्ज में डूबा जा रहा है, आन्तरिक कर्जा अत्यन्त विशाल हो गया है, जब देश के अंदर बड़े पैमाने पर कल-कारखाने बंद हो रहे है और कई तरह के दंगे-फसाद हो रहे है, साम्प्रदायिकता का तनाव हो रहा है उस वक्त में राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण ऐसा होना चाहिए था जो इस देश को आगे ले जाता और तमाम शक्तियों को मिलाकर आगे बढ़ता । इसको पढ़ने से अत्यन्त ही निराशा होती है । इसमें कुछ बातें जरुर हैं जिसमें शायद चुनाव को देखकर राष्ट्रपति महोदय से ऐसा कहलवाया गया है लेकिन उसमें भी कोई जान नहीं है कि वह क्या कहना चाहते हैं ।

मैं इस बात से सहमत हूं कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जो चीन गये हैं या पाकिस्तान गये हैं वह एक अच्छा कदम है । हम इसको समझते हैं आज की परिस्थिति में व्यक्तिगत सम्पर्क स्थापित करके जो वैदेशिक समस्या है उसको हल करने की कोशिश की जा रही है । इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री ने हमारे क्षेत्र में भी जो कहा है उससे हम को प्रसन्नता है । इसका प्रयास किया जाना चाहिए और समस्या का निदान किया जाना चाहिए । हमारे पड़ोस में जो अफगानिस्तान में घटना घट रही है उसके प्रति भी मैं इस बात का समर्थक हूं कि हमारी सरकार प्रेजीडेंट डा० नजीबुला के साथ अच्छे सम्बन्ध बनाये हुए है । वह हमारे राष्ट्रीय हित में है । अगर अफगानिस्तान जैसे मित्र को हम अपने हाथ से छोड़ देंगे तो वह भविष्य के लिए अत्यन्त खतरनाक साबित हो सकता है ।

कुछ और बातें हैं जिन के बारे में चर्चा करना चाहूंगा । अभी पैसिफिक रीजन या एशिया के क्षेत्र में जितने राष्ट्र हैं उसमें से कई राष्ट्र बड़ी तेजी से प्रगति कर रहे हैं । कुछ राष्ट्र हैं जो हम से बहुत छोटे हैं जैसे साउथ कोरिया, ताइवान, सिंगापुर और हांगकांग जैसे देश हैं जिनकी प्रगति हम से बहुत तेजी से हो रही है। साथ में हमारे पड़ोस में चीन है । यह भी बहुत तेजी से प्रगति कर रहा है । आज के हालात में अगर चारों तरफ से देश तेजी से प्रगति करते रहेंगे तो वह हमसे मजबूत हो जायेंगे और हमारे लिए यह अत्यन्त ही खतरनाक बात होगी, बहुत दुखद बात होगी ।

हांगकांग, कोरिया और सिंगापुर से हम भारत की तुलना नहीं कर सकते हैं लेकिन जो पीपुल्स रिपब्लिक आफ चायना है और जो दुनिया की सबसे आबादी का देश है उससे हमारे देश की तुलना की जा सकती है । हम सभी लोग जानते हैं कि इतनी बड़ी आबादी के देश ने वर्ल्ड बुलेटिन के मुताबिक कोयले के उत्पादन में, सीमेंट के उत्पादन में, अन्न के उत्पादन में और मांस के उत्पादन में विश्व का रिकार्ड तोड़ दिया है, सबसे आगे चला गया है । हमसे चीन के पास कम उपजाऊ जमीन है, लेकिन हम से कहीं ज्यादा ही नहीं, सबसे ज्यादा वर्ल्ड बुलेटिन के मुताबिक उसमें सोवियत संघ का फीगर नहीं है, अन्न का उत्पादन हो रहा है । कोई कारण नहीं कि हम भी ऐसा नहीं कर सकते हैं । सिवाय इसके कि हमारी सरकार सामंतवादी तत्वों का साथ देती है और पूंजीवादी पद्धति से काम करना चाहती है । लेकिन मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि जब चीन हम से साढ़े पांच गुना अधिक कोयले का उत्पादन कर सकता है और साढ़े चार गुना अधिक स्टील का उत्पादन कर सकता है तो हमें सोचना चाहिए कि हम ऐसा क्यों नहीं कर सकते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री को इन बातों का जवाब देना चाहिए और सिर्फ यह नही कहना चाहिए कि जब सुखाड़ पड़ा तो उसके मुकाबले हमने कितने परसेंट प्रगति की है । चीन ने जो रास्ता अख्तियार किया है, हम भी वही रास्ता अख्तियार करके प्रगति कर सकते हैं ।

राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में बहुत-सी बातें कही गई हैं और करीब 15 पैराज में विदेशों के बारे में कहा गया है कि कहां-कहां गये और वहां पर क्या-क्या किया । लेकिन एक शब्द भी मजदूरों के बारे में नहीं दिया गया है । पूरे भाषण को पढ़ने के बाद एक पंक्ति भी भारत के मजदूरों के बारे में नही मिलेगी । जो इस देश का निर्माण कर रहे हैं, सृजन कर रहे हैं । उनके बारे मे एक शब्द भी नहीं है । हमारे देश में इतने बड़े पैमाने पर कल-कारखाने बंद पड़े हुए हैं । इनको खोलने के लिए क्या सरकार के पास कोई कार्यक्रम है? कोई भी इस तरह की बात इसमें नहीं कही गई है । इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में भारत के मजदूर वर्ग की भारी उपेक्षा की गई है । मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि भारत सरकार का मजदूरों के प्रति स्नेह तो नहीं है, पूंजीपतियों के प्रति उनका स्नेह जरूर है । कम से कम एक पैरा तो मजदूरों के बारे में होना चाहिए था कि आप उनके लिए क्या करना चाहते हैं । हमारे देश के किसानों को कई समस्याओं से गुजरना पड़ रहा है। लाख-लाख किसान यहां बोट क्लब पर उचित मूल्यों के लिए प्रदर्शन करते हैं । ऐसी स्थिति में राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में 15 पैराज विदेश भ्रमण के बारे में दिये जा सकते है, लेकिन भारत के किसानों के बारे में उनकी समस्याओं के बारे में, एक पैरा भी नहीं दिया गया है । इसलिए इसको सिर्फ नामंजूर ही नहीं करना चाहिए बल्कि फाड़कर फेंक देना चाहिए ।

एक और चिन्ताजनक बात है । हमने इतिहास में पढ़ा था कि एक बार मुहम्मद तुगलक दिल्ली की गद्दी पर बैठा था। लेकिन हमें लगता है कि फिर एक बार मुहम्मद तुगलक दिल्ली की गद्दी पर बैठा है । हमें ऐसा क्यों कहना पड़ रहा है? 27 बार पिछले चार वर्षों में केबिनट का रिशफल किया गया है और अभी पार्लियामेंट का सेशन नही होता तो एक बार फिर वह हो जाता । अभी कई लोग

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

उम्मीद लगाये बैठे हैं कि शायद उनका भी कुछ हो जाय । प्रधानमंत्री यह तय नहीं कर पा रहे हैं कि किस को कहां पर रखा जाय । महाभारत में अर्जुन को द्रोणाचार्य ने उतनी जगह नहीं घुमाया होगा जितना अर्जुन को अभी घुमाया गया है । ऐसा लगता है कि मुख्य मंत्री केजुअल लेबर की तरह से हो गये है । केजुअल लेबर को भी नोटिस देकर हटाया जाता है, लेकिन यहां तो मुख्य मंत्री को रातों-रात हटा दिया जाता है । जिस पार्टी ने देश के सामने यह कहा था कि हम टिकाऊ सरकार देंगे उसके प्रधानमंत्री खुद ही अपनी सरकार को डिस्टेबिलाइज कर रहे है । मैं आपसे बिहार की चर्चा करना चाहता हूं । जहा अभी कोई सरकार चल नहीं रही है क्योंकि वहां जितने शासक पार्टी के माननीय सदस्य हैं, विधान मडल के सदस्य है वे कहते है कि हमको यह मुख्य मंत्री नहीं चाहिये । प्रधान मंत्री अड़े हुए है कि हमारा ही सूबेदार वहां रहेगा और इसके कारण टकराव हो रहा है और राज्य में कोई काम नही चल रहा है । यह मुहम्मद तुगलक के अलावा और कौन हो सकता है । बताइये इतिहास में एक ऐसा मुहम्मद तुगलक ही हुआ है और दूसरे हमारे प्रधान मंत्री हुए है । बगाल में अभी गवर्नर से कोई टकराव नहीं हो रहा है । वहां की सरकार और गवर्नर संविधान के मुताबिक काम कर रहे थे और अपनी रुचि के मुताबिक काम कर रहे थे । लेकिन यह दिल्ली से नहीं देखा गया और वहां पर गवर्नर को हटाकर हगामा कर दिया । शासक पार्टी के लोग हम लोगों को उपदेश देते है लेकिन उन लोगों ने गवर्नर पर हमला किया । अखबारों में यह बात आ चुकी है कि इन्होंने धक्कमधक्का किया । हमने कभी प्रधानमंत्री के साथ धक्कमधक्का नही किया, कभी चेयर के साथ धक्कमधक्का नहीं किया । लेकिन आप गवर्नर के साथ धक्कमधक्का करते हैं । यह एक लज्जाजनक स्थिति हैं जिसको रोकना हैं । यह सारे देश के सामने एक प्रश्न उपस्थित हो गया हैं ।

महोदय, देश में इस समय सांप्रदायिक आग लगी हुई हैं और हमारी शासक पार्टी के लोग क्या करते हैं ; मिजोरम के चुनाव के घोषणापत्र में उन्होंने लिखा है कि क्रिश्चियन प्रिंसिपल्स के मुताबिक सरकार कायम की जायेगी । यह आपके घोषणा पत्र में है कि मिजोरम के लोग क्रिश्चियन प्रिंसिपल्स के मुताबिक राज करेंगे । अगर ऐसा है तो कश्मीर के लोग क्यों नही कहेंगे कि शरीयत के मुताबिक राज करो और तब हमारे वाजपेयी जी, वे इस समय नहीं हैं देवरस जी वे क्यों नहीं कहेंगे कि हम मनुस्मृति के मुताबिक राज करेंगे । अगर ऐसा होगा तो संविधान का क्या होगा । शासक पार्टी में बहुत ही वरिष्ठ लोग हैं, आजादी की लड़ाई में हिस्सा लेने वाले लोग है । हां, उनकी मौजूदा जनरेशन ने आजादी की लड़ाई में भले ही हिस्सा न लिया हो । लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि अगर आप मिजोरम के क्रिश्चियन धर्म के आधार पर राज करेंगे तो दूसरे लोग इस तरह की मांग क्यों नहीं करेंगे ? आपकी इस नीति के चलते देश में यह साम्प्रदायिक आग भड़क रही है । आपने पंजाब में पहले ऐसा ही किया था और वहां एक गुट को साथ रखने के लिये, आज जो टेरोरिस्ट लोग है, उनको सहायता कर रहे थे । आपने मुस्लिम लीग के साथ समझौता किया । आप हम लोगों को कह सकते थे कि आपने भी किया । लेकिन हमने उसको स्वीकार किया है कि हमने गलत किया । लेकिन आप अभी भी कर रहे हैं । यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है । राष्ट्रपति जी अपने अभिभाषण में एक तरफ सुन्दर शब्दों में कहते हैं कि साम्प्रदायिकता बहुत खराब है लेकिन दूसरी तरफ आप भी साम्प्रदायिकता को बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि यह किस प्रकार की नीति है । यह भारत को

बरबाद करने की नीति है । जिस देश में साम्प्रदायिक आग इतनी तेजी से दहक रही है वहां इस तरह का घोषणा पत्र देना और किसी धर्म विशेष के लिये देना यह एक अत्यन्त ही दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण बात है । इसलिये मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि कांग्रेस जो उनके मूल सिद्धान्त थे उन से अलग होकर वह साम्प्रदायिकता की ओर जा रही है, धर्मान्धता में जा रही है और जिस किसी तरह से वोट हासिल करके राज करने की बातें कर रही है । इससे हमारे देश क खंडित होने की संभावना हो गई है ।

एक और बात है जिसके बारे मे उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं चर्चा करना चाहूंगा । मै जानता हूं कि भारत सरकार की अभी तक क्या नीति रही है, विदेश मामले में । उसकी नीति रही है कि जो नान-अलाइंड कन्ट्रीज हैं उनके साथ रहने की और उनको साथ लेकर जो विश्व साम्राज्यवाद है उसके मुकाबले में अपनी नीति को प्रतिपादित करने की भारत सरकार की नीति रही है । लेकिन इधर दो घटनायें घटी हैं जिनसे हमें लग रहा है कि भारत सरकार अपनी नान-अलाइंड की पालिसी का त्याग कर रही है और शायद साम्राज्यवादियों के साथ सांठ-गांठ करने की बात चल रही है । महोदय, अभी दिल्ली में इटरनेशनल एकानामिक जर्नलिस्टस का एक सिम्पोजियम, एक विचार गोष्ठी का आयोजन किया गया था। उसमें भारत सरकार की तरफ से हमारे विदेश विभाग के दुबे जी गये थे । वे शायद अभी ज्वाइंट सेक्रेटरी है या एडिशनल सेक्रेटरी हैं, मुझे अभी याद नहीं आ रही है । उन्होंने वहां यह कहा कि इस बात की संभावना है कि न्यू एकानामिक आर्डर स्थापित किया जाय । इसलिये भारत जो 77 नान-अलाइंड देशों का नेता है उसमें वह न रहकर जो मीडियम डेवलपमेंट कन्ट्रीज हैं उनके साथ अलग से, जो सात बड़े एकानामिक देश हैं जैसे कि जापान, अमेरिका, जर्मनी वगैरह है, उनके साथ समझौता करने की बात होनी चाहिये यह अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विचार गोष्ठी में जाकर भारत सरकार एक-एक सचिव बोलता है । सरकार इस नीति को त्याग रही है जो अभी तक हमारी नीति रही हैं नहीं तो भारत सरकार स्पष्टीकरण करे । मैं यह समझता हूं कि एक सेक्रेटरी के कह देने से ही सारी बात नहीं होती है लेकिन अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विचारगोष्ठी में इस तरह की बात आये यह अत्यंत चिन्ताजनक बात है । क्या भारत सरकार ने कोई ऐसी नीति निर्धारित की है जिसमें हम उसको परित्याग करके इन लोगों के साथ जाना चाहते है और जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय न्यू इकोनोमिक आर्डर के लिए संघर्ष चल रहा था क्या हम वह छोड़ने जा रहे हैं । यह प्रश्न मैं जानना चाहता हूं । मैं इसलिए इस बात की चर्चा कर रहा हूं कि जो भयंकर भोपाल गैस कांड हुआ था उसमें जो मल्टी नेशनल कम्पनी इनवाल्व थी उसके खिलाफ भी भारत सरकार ने जाने की हिम्मत नहीं दिखलाई है मैंने उस दिन जब इस विषय पर चर्चा हो रही थी तो यह प्रश्न उठाया था कि जो हमारा युनाइटेड नेशंस का एक कोड आफ कंडक्ट बना हुआ है कि ट्रांस नेशनल कम्पनीज के बारे में उसके अनुसार भी यह मामला आपने यूनाइटेड नेशंस में क्यों नहीं उठाया । यूनियन कारबाइड भी एक ट्रांस नेशनल कम्पनी है । अगर वह हमारी बात को नहीं मान रही थी जबकि विश्व की सब से बड़ी औद्योगिक दुर्घटना घटी थी तो हमने यूनाइटेड नेशंस में यह सवाल क्यों नहीं उठाया । उस दिन मुझे इस का मंत्री जी ने कोई जवाब नहीं दिया । हम को यह लग रहा हैं कि क्या आप ट्रांस नेशनल कम्पनीज को भारत में बुलाने के लिए यह हम लोगों की लाशें बेच रहे हैं, भोपाल की लाशें इसलिए बेच रहे है ताकि उनको लोगों को बुलावा दिया जा सके नहीं तो क्या कारण है कि आपने यह सवाल नहीं उठाया मैंने यह प्रश्न भी उस दिन उठाया था कि हम वारेन एंडरसन को यहां बुला सकते थे क्योंकि भारत सरकार ने अभी तक एक्युज्ड के आदान-प्रदान के लिए एक्सट्रेडिशन ट्रीटी नहीं की है यह भी भारत सरकार का कसूर हैं ।

[श्री चतुरानन मिश्र]

इसके चलते ऐसा नहीं हुआ यह भी भारत सरकार का कसूर है कि जो पेरेंट कम्पनी यूनियन कारबाइड कारपोरेशन है उसके बारे में ही नहीं बल्कि तमाम ट्रांस नेशनल कम्पनीज के बारे में कोई कानून हमने नहीं बनाया। अगर हमारे यहां ऐसी दुर्घटना घटी तो उसके लिए पेरेंट कम्पनी जिम्मेदार है। यह बातें बता रही हैं कि हमारी सरकार शायद किसी दूसरी दिशा में जाना चाहती है। यह अत्यंत चिन्ता की बात होगी। इसलिए मैंने इस प्रश्न को उठाया था।

जहां तक श्रीलंका में हमारी फौज की वापसी का प्रश्न है मैं समझता हूं कि अब उसका वक्त आ गया है। किसी दूसरे देश की एथनिक समस्या को दूसरे देश की फौज जा कर के हल नहीं कर सकती। हमारे यहां भी ऐसी समस्याएं हैं तो उस समस्या को ले कर कोई बिदेशी फौज आ कर तय नहीं करेगी। आपने उनका एक एग्रीमेंट करवा दिया एग्रीमेंट के मुताबिक चुनाव हुआ अब उनको यह खुद संभालना चाहिये। कहीं ऐसा न हो कि हम को यह नारा दिया जाए कि भारतीय वापिस जाएं [हैंड्ज आफ इण्डियंस का नारा उठे इसके पहले ही मैं सरकार से यह कहूंगा अभी जैसे एक टुकड़ी वापिस की है इस मामले में शीघ्रता कर के सारी फौज को वहां से वापिस बुला लिया जाए। इसके लिए अबिलम्ब कार्यवाही की जानी चाहिये।

अंत में मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। अपने देश की हालत काफी खराब है। शासक पार्टी उसको माने या न माने आर्थिक दृष्टिकोण से, साम्प्रदायिक दंगों के दृष्टिकोण से और जो तरह तरह की शक्तियां उभर रही हैं उनको देखते हुए एक ऐसा आर्थिक, सामाजिक और राजनैतिक कार्यक्रम देश के सामने आना चाहिये जिससे लोग इसकी ओर आकर्षित हो सकें और इसके लिए काम कर सकें यह करने में यह सरकार बिलकुल अक्षम साबित हो रही है। इसीलिए इस देश में विघटनकारी तत्व पैदा हो रहे हैं। इसलिए मैं यह मांग करता हूं कि यह जो आपने अभिभाषण किया है वह आज की परिस्थितियों के प्रतिकूल है। कुछ वोट हासिल करने के लिए अपने मुंह से अपनी तारीफ आप कर लीजिए यह आपको अधिकार है हम आपको रोकने के लिए नहीं जा रहे हैं लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि देश की जो परिस्थिति है उसके बिलकुल प्रतिकूल आप जा रहे हैं। इसलिए इस देश के अन्दर जो एक रास्ता निकलना चाहिये मौजूदा संकट से निकलने का उस में आप बिलकुल अक्षम है। राष्ट्रपति का यह जो अभिभाषण है इसके बिलकुल प्रतिकूल हैं जैसे मैंने कहा कि इस में एक शब्द भी मजदूरों के बारे में नहीं है किसानों की समस्याओं के बारे में नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि भारत जैसे देश में हमारे किसानों की ज्वलंत समस्याओं की ओर मजदूरों की ओर लाखों कारखानों में जो मजदूर काम करते हैं उनकी समस्याओं के बारे में इस अभिभाषण में एक भी शब्द नहीं हैं तो यह कोई अभिभाषण नहीं है। इसलिए मैं इसके विरोध में खड़ा हुआ था। धन्यवाद।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address moved by Shri P. N. Sukul.

I am grateful for the special mention which the President has made in his Address both to the importance of youth and its participation in the political process in the country and also his reference to the perspective plan which has been drawn up by our Government for improving the status of women in the country.

Sir, I would like to say that this Government for the last four years has kept its commitments and has proved to be a Government that has worked. I know that Members on the other side will have many things to say, many things to criticize because, after all, the role of the Opposition is to find fault as far as possible and point out what has not been done. I do not, therefore, object to what has been said. But I would also like to draw their attention to the many achievements of the last four years in spite of the problems that we have faced.

Sir, it was we who brought in for the first time the Anti-Defection Bill. We are in the process of bringing the youth at the age of 18 into the political process by lowering the voting age. We are in the process of going further in our commitment to give power to the people by trying to re-introduce some of the institutions which would guarantee this. We have, in spite of severe drought over two years, been able to keep the economy going and provide the type of support to those affected by drought which perhaps would not have been possible without an efficient management which we were able to give. There has been increased investment in agriculture, in rural development on a massive scale and, in spite of all that has been said, in the public sector itself.

Sir there were many who believed when the Rajiv Gandhi Government took over that we were in for a total change, that we would immediately give up many of the policies of the past and overnight come out with a free economy and change in everything that many people have been unhappy about. And therefore he was hailed as a saviour who would bring in a new chapter. But the very people who had hailed him, when they found after two years that our commitment to creating a socialist society, to carrying on with the principles which we have fought for many years were still going strong, then suddenly everything changed, and vested interests have started a campaign as it were not only against him but against everything that the Government has tried to do.

Sir, I would like to say that over the four years the hand of friendship has been extended. In difficult areas, which seemed unmanageable, the Prime Minister with his personal intervention has been able to find solutions, bring people back to the negotiating table and make them realise that the answers lay in the power of the ballot box and not in violence and underground activities.

Sir, particularly to the north-east reference was made. Whenever elections are won by the Opposition in the north-east, then they are fair elections, they are properly conducted and the people's will prevails! But when the Congress wins an election, then ballot boxes have been changed, everything has been manipulated, wrong forces have been brought into play, and the usual tale of woe follows!

Sir, I have been associated with the north-east for many years now. I have participated in many election campaigns. I am not going to say much because whatever I say on the religious front will be misquoted because, fortunately or unfortunately I will be identified simply because I am a Christian. But I do want to say that between the 70's and now...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): You are a human being.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Something was quoted about the controversy. I am not going into

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

these questions. I believe that the centralist forces and the nationalist forces have come to prevail in the north-east. I can say this from my own experience. When I was there for the first time in 1975-76, I was introduced at a public meeting by the local people with a great deal of enthusiasm: We are so happy, this is Mrs. Alva; she has come all the way from India! As if we were a different world altogether and they were a different world. All these feelings have gone now. There is so much of integration and so much of support to the national Government and to the ethos of the nation as a whole. I think we have to appreciate the various measures that we have taken in order to build this confidence and in order to build stronger links between particularly the younger people. I deal with them as the Minister for Youth Affairs. We used to have our integration camps in other parts of the country and we used to invite them there. They are now saying: "Why should we go and learn from you and why should you not get the youth of the rest of the country together here and learn from us?" We are now organising these integration camps in the Noth-Eastern States as well. They will play host to the youth from other parts of the country. Therefore, I say that there is no point in picking quarrels which may be a statement made by some individual or with something that happened somewhere. It is important to look at the changing picture in the North-East. Those who are underground are laying down arms and coming forward to participate in the political process, in the democratic process. These are sensitive areas on our borders which have to be treated with a certain amount of sensitivity and a certain amount of understanding. Therefore, I would say that we have been able to do these things. Whatever anybody may say, we shall continue with our commitment to these principles.

About my own Department, I think I should mention that as far as youth affairs are concerned, the two-thirds of our population is under the age of 45 and this is a very important segment of our population. It is very important for us to be able to get the involvement of this very important section and to strengthen their commitment to the democratic process. Unless we are able to set certain standards and make the youth have faith and confidence in the political process, I think it would be very difficult to really utilise this great human resource, our youth, in our political system. Sir, we have got before Parliament the National Youth Policy which I hope will be debated during this session of Parliament. It has already been presented. We have to set up a National Youth Advisory Committee which brings together various sections of our youth as well as organisations. We have restored the national youth festivals which had been abandoned in the 60s because it was believed that it caused too much of trouble bringing so many young people together. We are having them for the last three years with great success. In 1986, we also instituted the National Youth Awards to reward one organisation and outstanding youth in different fields of activities. The budget for youth activities went up from 13 crores of rupees in the Sixth Plan to 100 crores of rupees in the Seventh Plan. The N.S.S. expanded from 6.12 volunteers in 1985 to 9.72 lakh volunteers in 1989 and it will reach 10 lakh volunteers by 1990. On every front of youth activity there has been progress. In the case of Nehru Yuvak Kendras, from 196 kendras in 1985 in 196 districts, we have reached 357 districts and we will cover all the districts of the country during the

Nehru Centenary Year in order to keep our commitment. The Nehru Yuva Sangathan has become an autonomous body. Nehru Yuvak Kendras are helping the self-employed youth in marketing and are giving them support for the sale of their products. We have been registered the Nehru Yuva Cooperative as a part of our contribution to the Nehru Centenary Year

As far as sports are concerned, there have been many debates and I won't go into details because I think I have placed before this House repeatedly all that we have been doing. I am sure you will say that we have not been able to improve our performance in international events. I can assure you that we are in the process of putting things right. Our budget for sports went up from Rs. 11 crores in the Sixth Plan to Rs. 200 crores in the Seventh Plan giving us a certain amount of support in this work. The Dronacharya Awards were instituted for outstanding coaches and many other schemes for coaching and training have also come in. I am here to mention that we have made a proposal which emerged from a consensus statement at two meetings of State Ministers of Sports and Youth Affairs during the last four years for bringing sports on the Concurrent List. Unfortunately, in spite of being a consensus statement, when it was brought in this House, there was a big controversy created. Well, everybody blames the Central Government when something goes wrong. Everybody asks Mrs. Alva to quit when the medals do not come...

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No no. With your permission, Sir, if my charming colleague would yield for a moment Mrs. Alva is advocating that which requires no advocacy, because we are unanimous in our appreciation of the sterling work that she is doing, as a Minister for the portfolios that she is holding, and not a word of criticism has passed from any of us about her sincerity and dedication to her work. We are talking about the larger collectivity of this Government, about which we hold different views. And no one has asked for her resignation.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Thank you, Sir. I am touched by your kind sentiments. Sir, all that I am saying is that we feel that sports is today a State subject. And unless the Centre also can be given some say in working out an all-India pattern in dealing with the Federations and various other problems, it is very difficult for us to work. And, therefore, I have already today addressed a letter to the Leaders of the Opposition, which I hope they will respond to, asking them that this subject be kept out of political controversy. And I am glad to say that the Government of Karnataka, in our recent meeting, has made a commitment that they will support the Concurrent List proposal. I am in touch with the other States also and I am sure that at least this subject of sports will be kept out of any political cross-currents in the interest of the development of sports.

Sir, I am also glad to say that though we did not get the Commonwealth Games in spite of our best efforts, but unanimously the first ever Afro-Asian games have been allotted to India which will be hosted by us in 1991 bringing more than 35 countries together and which will be next in size only to the Olympic games and much larger than the Asian games. We hope that we will be able to organise them with the same efficiency that we did the Asian Games in the past. But, Sir, I would like to say, when I speak about sports that we require far greater co-operation from the States in implementing many of our programmes. I have before me here, Sir, the figures. We have from Rs. 3 crores in the 6th Plan increased our

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

contribution to developmnet of infrastructure in the States to Rs. 60 crores in the 7th Plan, a 20-time jump if I may say so. And yet when we look at the projects in the different States, I have today before me a list of 2,257 incomplete projects lying in the States. We give the first instalment, the matching grant from the State never comes. In fact, in many cases—I do not want to name the States—the grant we sent to the States is not disbursed to the district or to the local bodies which are supposed to be constructing this infrastructure with the result that they are not even able to complete something beyond the foundation-stone or maybe the first phase. And yet we go on getting requests that more and more infrastructure should be allotted to the States. We have decided, therefore, that until these are completed we will not go in for new projects in the States because it is just a waste of tax-payer's money.

Sir, I must mention, of course, a few things about my portfolio of women. After all, we are, perhaps, the most neglected section of the past but by far the most valuable human resource you have in this country even though we are not 50 per cent of the population because of various factors. Sir, from Rs. 255.91 crores in the 6th Plan, we were given Rs. 740 crores in the 7th Plan, giving us again a great deal of scope for increasing our work. Sir, the National Committee on Women was reconstituted after a gap of almost 5 yeras: it has been helping us very much. We have brought in a lot of legislation in which I have received support from all of you, including the two new Acts for the Prevention of Sati and the other one, the Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act, Sir, speaking about Sati, there was a hue and cry and we were told that we had not done this or we had not done that. I am constrained to say that even responsible Members of this House—recently there was a statement by a very responsible woman Member of the House—.

3 P.M.

..who justify sati by saying that this is in keeping with the tradition and if a woman wants to burn herself, she must be allowed to do so. That representatives of the people should make statements like this and that too women Members of this House when we are literally battling to try to change these concepts is something which is very unfortunate. It is so easy to tell us that the Government has got to do something, as if women in other parties or even other Members have no responsibility on this question. I do not want to name anybody. But I was in Rajasthan recently and there was tremendous unhappiness that such a distinguished woman of this House should have made a statement like that. I am glad to say that this week while marking the International Women's Week. We will be opening our first home for widows, a commitment I had made on the floor of the House, close to Deorala in Sikar, to tell the women of Rajasthan that we have now established something where widows irrespective of caste or creed or religion could go and spend their days doing whatever they wanted to do with many other activities thrown in for them. Sir, here again I would like to say that with all our legislation implementation is essentially with the State Governments. In Parliament questions are asked, figures are given—so many more women have been burnt, so many more women have died, so many more dowry cases registered and what is the Government doing? Sir I do want to point out that if there are more cases registered and if there is more of this being seen today, it is simply because the laws have become a little more effective because of women. Also because women have become aware of their rights and therefore are going to police stations, to courts, registering complaints and

asking for redress. There were times when all this was happening behind closed doors in the name of family secrecy but today there is a fight by women in law courts and in counselling centres. Here again, Sir, we have the cases where people in responsible positions where such incidents take place in their families close their doors and say —

सब कुछ ठीक है, इन्क्वायरी भी नहीं चाहिए, कुछ भी नहीं चाहिए ।

In spite of all the controversies they refuse even to go through the normal processes. I must say that the proper procedures laid down under the law are not even followed by people simply because they are in certain positions and they think that they are above the law. I am referring particularly to the need for post mortem by two doctors, not in one's private room or in one's house, but in the hospital. Why was it not done in Haryana? When we ask these questions, we are told that we are politicising these questions. Sir, there is no politics in the death of a daughter-in-law or grand-daughter-in-law. She has a right to live and I think every person, in whichever position, has a duty to see that the law of the land is enforced and this was my plea when I spoke earlier in the other House that unless people in responsible positions help us in enforcing the law and stand up for the rights of women, there is no point in asking me why this happens and that happens.

Sir, the Family Courts Bill was passed in 1984. I am sorry to say that except for UP, Rajasthan, (UP has two courts, Rajasthan has one) Karnataka has one and Tamil Nadu has one, none of the other States have taken steps to set up family courts as yet. To my inquiry this week, I have been given six States which are in the process of notifying family courts. I think these are some of the problems of implementation for which the States must be held responsible. Sir, we have been asking for special cells to be created for dealing with crimes against women. Very few States are paying any attention to this either. As far as Women's Development Corporations are concerned, we have them in 11 States and three more are in the process of setting them up. The grant from the Centre is 49 per cent and the States are supposed to put in 51 per cent. That was at their request because they wanted to have the controlling interest with 51 per cent of capital from them. This will help very much in training women, creating employment opportunities and giving marketing and other financial support even to individual and small groups of entrepreneurs and producers.

Sir, we had three commissions set up. One was the Justice Krishna Iyer Commission for Women Prisoners. One was Ila Bhat Commission, which went into the problems of self-employed women, particularly in the unorganised sector. We had these two commissions set up, and the third was the core group which has drafted and presented to the country a document known as the National Perspective Plan for Women, making detailed recommendations under 8 different sectors for action to be taken over the next decade to improve the status of women. This is now before the Cabinet and I hope that before long, certain announcements based on those recommendations would be possible for us to make.

The first announcement which the Rajiv Gandhi Government made after coming to power was that education for girls up to High School would be free, and that any expenditure incurred by the State Governments on this account would be reimbursed by the Central Government. The new education policy has also laid great emphasis on education for equality. We are hoping that the States will

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

respond and take greater initiative in making women's education a priority as far as their programmes are concerned. We have also set up 23 centres for women's studies in the universities to sensitize the so-called intellectual thinking community of the country to the problems of women and to create an atmosphere for looking at women's issues in the correct perspective. Programmes for legal literacy, para-legal training and consultancy and free legal aid have also been introduced.

On the administrative side, I would like to mention that there are many measures we have sought to take. One is the circulars issued from the Department of Personnel to ensure that the husband and wife are posted together as far as possible when both are working either in the Central Government or in a public sector undertaking; the requirements to have women on the selection boards for Government and public sector undertakings; women component in the training of bureaucracy has been introduced as a compulsory part of the training of our IAS, IPS and other officers. Women cells in different Ministries have been created to monitor and look after the programmes for women—not in all the Ministries; but six of them have already started them. We were also responsible for correcting the interpretation of some clauses of the maternity benefits rules which were weighed against women and we have also launched a campaign for opening creches in all the Ministries in Delhi, in all our Central Ministries, as a kind of model for others to follow, because Government being the largest employer in Delhi, we felt Ministries should give the lead to provide relief to working women. We are in the process of moving from what we call the Women's Division in the National Institute of Public Cooperation, and Child Development to having afull-fledged National Resource Centre to deal with all matters concerning women programmes, policies and other issues. This will really be the central and monitoring point for all programmes affecting women.

We have played a very important role in SAARC. We head the Technical Committee on Women for three years and have organised a number of programmes for women in SAARC countries. Most of all, it is because of our initiative by calling the SAARC workshop for the first time in Delhi, that the Heads of Governments recently decided to declare 1990 as the Year of the Girl Child in the SAARC countries to focus on the problems of the girl child and her survival.

The ICDS has grown from 33 blocks in 197 and gone up to 1091 blocks in 1985, to 1736 blocks in 1989, with another 500 to be sanctioned this year after the new Budget. Therefore, on all these fronts, we have seen a tremendous expansion as far as our efforts are concerned. And yet, we had a Member—he did not have the time to wait—who stood up and said that the Prime Minister was behaving like Mohammad Bin Tughlak. It is easy to sit and try to fit the cap on other people's head. We have today on the national scene a tragic comedian who, till the other day sat here and talked about his great 'loyalty to the leader'. And perhaps because there is a shortage of leaders on the other side, the day he left, he was welcomed. He was made a hero and all the opposition leaders today bow their heads in humble tribute to his leadership. Anybody who sits on this side is corrupt, anybody who sits on this side does not know how to run the Government, anybody who sits on this side is incapable of doing anything, but the moment they cross that line they become saints, they become leaders, they become potential world leaders, if I may say so.

There was in my own State—if I may start with the tragic story—a great leader who was projected as 'Mr. Clean', who was projected as the alternative Prime Minister, who was projected as the man who could do no evil. This very man today, day in and day out is being mentioned in every conceivable scandal. I do not mention people, I do not mention names. When a Member of this House exposes his own party leader, and exposes his scandals he is called a 'political vandal' but when a man from here goes there and starts exposing his imaginary fears or his imaginary discoveries, then he becomes a saint and a prophet. Why have two different norms for judging people This is what I would like to ask the few hon. Members on the other side who are present. Does it mean that the day you shed the Congress... *(Interruptions)*. I am talking about you because you all have been there. I am asking about the land scandals, about all the other scandals which have come up not because of us but by his own colleagues, his own former Ministers, party members, his own party MLAs even today. Sir, I would like to ask, in which State have we had the great distinction of having a Home Minister of a Government—as in my own State today—standing trial with his police chief for his involvement in the murder of a lawyer? These are the standards which you are trying to sell in the name of 'Mr. Clean' and a clean government I have never spoken like this in this House. I have never attacked anybody, but time has come for us also to call a spade a spade. You cannot have one set of standards for one of leaders and another set of standards for another set of leaders.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is right.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Here is a man who has openly said that the returns I have filed (Mr. V. P. Singh) are not full, they are in part, I will file the rest of them later on. And, Sir, you will pardon me saying it that there is another Chief Minister, not in this House, who says, "I have put the statement of my assets in a sealed cover and handed it over to the Chief Secretary. If you want to know my assets, go to the Chief Secretary and ask him to give you the details." This was four years ago.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): What is wrong in that? There is nothing wrong.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: You are not a partyman, now you are in the Chair. I am just saying that this is the statement of a public figure about public declaration of his assets. What is the public declaration of assets? It is that it has been put in a sealed cover and if you want to know it go to the Chief Secretary and find it out from him. What are we trying to talk about? And yet you say that these people, may be just because some have beards and some have saffron robes, are holy men. I want to know, what is the rule under which we are classifying these different leaders? Since so much credibility is given to the press these days, whatever appears in the press, whatever is mentioned there becomes the gospel as it were of the opposition or if I may use the word, the 'Quran', or whatever you may call it of the opposition, I have got clippings from the papers which I can lay here and say, well if this is what the press is reporting, then so and so must go, so and so must go and so on.

Instead a man steps down in my State and he becomes the Vice-President of a party a big promotion, a leap forward, if I may say so, from his position in my State. This is how you reward those who have been discredited in the States and brought here, you are talking about our changing State

[Shrimati Margaret Alva]

leaders. Yes, when we find that a certain person is not able to perform, because the party has a responsibility and if the High Command sometimes or the party feels that we need a change, it is for the party to decide what is to be done in that State. Sir, you have had in your own State the Chief Minister one fine morning deciding that everybody must go and that he would decide...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): The Chief Minister has the prerogative.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Exactly, Sir, the prerogatives are there. Your party has to deal with one State. Other parties like ours have to deal with many.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY): Let the Prime Minister do it.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: I have to say it because he is interrupting me.

SHRI VIRENDRA VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): Speak on the President's Address.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Yes, Sir. I only want to say here that President has spoken about the democratic process, about certain norms being followed. I am only saying that every time the Opposition stands up to speak, all that is talked about is of Government being corrupt, Government being involved in scandals and of something being wrong with us all the time. I only want to appeal to this House that if we are going to see that democracy functions, it has to so do with both of us, and not with one section of the House. Sometimes, if I may say so, as a mother it reminds me of a spoilt child who, every time he does not have his way, walks out of the house and keeps howling outside until somebody has to go, pat him, give him a lollipop and say : "Please forget it, come back home and it will not happen again". This kind of attitude that if things do not go my way, if there is something I do not like then every thing has to stand still and you have to fall in line, I think, has to change.

Sir, I am grateful for this opportunity to participate, but before I close I would just like to speak besides at home about the great strides that we have made also in the international field—about the thawing of relations with China, for which the Prime Minister took the initiative to go and meet rather than to continue this permanent feeling of, shall I say, suspicion between the two countries. The Prime Minister's visit to Pakistan has generated the hope that a new chapter of relations in the sub-continent between our two countries would be possible. The great role being played by India in international fora on the questions of disarmament, of bringing the power blocs together and, most of all, the great respect with which the country and the Prime Minister have been held not only in the Non Aligned world but in all forums for his contribution and for his commitment have to be accepted. Whether it is the case of Namibian freedom or fighting apartheid in South Africa, or guaranteeing a more just economic order, on all these issues India's initiatives have been hailed and those of us who have had opportunities to participate in international meetings and meet people know the respect with which we are held and the pride with which we participate in these meetings, thanks to the policy of Pandit Nehru, which was strengthened and moved forward by our late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and which today the Prime Minister, with great courage is carrying forward in every international forum. And I believe that with all this—I do not want to take more time—this Government has proved beyond doubt that the faith the people had reposed in us in 1985 has been a faith which we have kept,

a commitment which we have fulfilled and a promise which we have not forgotten. Thank you.

श्री धीरेन्द्र वर्मा : माननीय उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आदरणीय राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने अभिभाषण में दस ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषयों पर चर्चा की है जिनका उल्लेख करना मैं अपना कर्तव्य मानता हूं । रूस और अमेरिका में पहली बार संसार को विनाश से बचाने और शांति स्थापित करने के लिए रूस के राष्ट्रपति ने पहल की । एक श्रेणी के परमाणु अस्त्र बिल्कुल नष्ट कर दिये गये इसकी माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने चर्चा की अफगानिस्तान में भी शांति स्थापित हो, वहां खून खराबा हो रहा है, गरीब देश है और निर्गुट देशों का मित्र है । यह भी कोशिश की गयी कि जैनेवा समझौते के अनुसार 15 फरवरी तक अपनी सेवाएं हटाये । रूस ने हटायी लेकिन यह दुख का विषय है कि पाकिस्तान और अमेरिका आज भी उस देश को खतरनाक हथियार सप्लाई कर रहे हैं । मुझे उम्मीद है भारत निरन्तर यह प्रयास जारी रखेगा और वहां शांति स्थापित होगी ।

तीसरी बात, राष्ट्रपति माननीय गोर्बोचोव को उनके साहसी और शांति स्थापित करने के कदम पर पूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी शांति पुरस्कार से सम्मानित किया गया । यह भी उल्लेखनीय है कि नामीबिया देश की आजादी का मार्ग प्रशस्त हुआ । भारत हमेशा से उसके लिए सक्रिय भूमिका अदा करता रहा है । स्वतंत्र फिलिस्तीनी राष्ट्र को भारत ने मान्यता प्रदान की । यह भी स्वागत योग्य कदम है । पाकिस्तान में 12 साल बाद डेमोक्रेसी स्थापित हुई, लोकतंत्र स्थापित हुआ । वहां की जनता बधाई की पात्र है । मुझे विश्वास है दोनों देशों में आपसी सम्बन्ध मधुर होंगे और शांति स्थापित होगी ।

धर्म को राजनीति से पृथक करने का प्रयास करने के लिए एक कानून बनाया गया । श्रीमती मार्ग्रेट अल्वा अभी बोल रही थी । व्यक्तिगत नाम लिये बगैर उन्होंने अटैक किया । मै बगैर अटैक किये माननीय मार्ग्रेट अल्वा जी का ध्यान उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके द्वारा खींचना अवश्य चाहता हूं कि धर्म को राजनीति से पृथक करने का कानून बना था । लेकिन मिजोरम में अब चुनाव हुए तो उसमें कांग्रेस ने धर्म का पूरा सहारा लिया । जो इलेक्शन मैनिफेस्टो जारी किया वह इसका सबूत है । तमिलनाडु में इलेक्शन हुए वहां मुस्लिम लीग जिसने धर्म के नाम पर देश का बटवारा किया था उस मुस्लिम लीग के साथ मिलकर चुनाव लड़ा गया । (**व्यवधान**) प्रधान मंत्री जी अपने उत्तर मे बता देंगे । मै तो आक्षेप कर रहा हूं किसी नेता का नाम लेकर नहीं जैसा माननीय मार्ग्रेट अल्वा जी ने किया । मैं कह रहा हूं कि धर्म के नाम पर आपने मिजोरम का इलेक्शन लड़ा । धर्म के नाम पर मुस्लिम लीग से मिलकर केरल में और तमिलनाडु में आपने इलेक्शन लड़ा । इसका मुझे खेद है ।

जहां तक आपने 1 वर्ष की आयु वाले को चुनाव में मत देने के अधिकार चर्चा की, पार्लियामेंट की प्रोसीडिंग उठा कर देखिये । सन् 70 की पेटीशन कमेटी की रिकमेंडेशन है, संस्तुति है कि मत देने के अधिकार की आयु 18 वर्ष की जाये । और 1972 में संस्तुति की और 1977 में जब जनता पार्टी की सरकार थी तो उसने अपने मैनीफेस्टो में यह कहा कि वोट देने की आयु 18 वर्ष की जाय ।

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय में युवा कार्य और खेल तथ महिला और बाल विकास विभागों में राज्य मंत्री (**श्रीमती मार्ग्रेट अल्वा**) : लेकिन इम्प्लीमेंट तो नहीं किया ।

श्री धीरेन्द्र वर्मा : आप कृपया सुनती रहें । जब आप बोल रही थीं तो मैंने आपको नहीं टोका । मैं यह कहना चाहता

[श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा]

हूं कि इसी सदन के सदस्य श्री सदा प्रकाश मालवीय जी ने जो इस समय उपस्थित नहीं हैं उन्होंने एक प्रस्ताव पेश किया था कि वोट देने की आयु 18 वर्ष की जाय । आज आपने जो कानून बनाया वह हूबहू उनके नान-आफिशियल में था जिसको आज सरकार ने एडाप्ट किया है । मैं आपकी इस बात के लिए तारीफ करता हूं कि पुरानी जनता की मांग को, विरक्षी दलों की मांग को, आपने माना है, इसके लिए आप प्रशंसा के पात्र हैं । आपने कुछ चुनाव सुधार भी किये, सम्पूर्ण नहीं किये तो अधूरे किये, लेकिन किये जिसके लिए आप प्रशंसा के पात्र हैं । मान्यवर, लोकतंत्र में पंचयती राज तक पहुंचा जाय, यह बहुत जरूरी है । महात्मा गांधी बहुत दिनों से कहते रहे कि पंचायती राज स्थापित किया जाय । लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अंग्रेजों के जमाने में तो जिला परिषदों को जो अधिकार थे वे भी अधिकार अब उनके पास नहीं हैं । आज जिला परिषदों के पास प्राइमरी शिक्षा और मिडिल स्कूल की शिक्षा भी नहीं है । यही कारण है कि आज सर्वनाश हो रहा है और गांवों में प्राइमरी शिक्षा भी खत्म हो गई है । मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि 1982 में जब दिल्ली में मट्रोपोलिटन कौंसिल के चुनाव थे और नगर निगम के चुनाव थे तो कांग्रेस पार्टी ने अपने चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में यह कहा था कि दिल्ली को राज्य का दर्जा दिया जाएगा । 1984 में जब लोकसभा के चुनाव हुए तो पुनः यह आश्वासन दिया गया कि दिल्ली को राज्य का दर्जा दिया जाएगा । अब 1989 के चुनाव खड़े हैं, लेकिन अपने वायदे को कांग्रेस ने पूरा नहीं किया है । मुझे इस बात की खुशी होगी कि प्रधान मंत्री जी दिल्ली में एक सम्मेलन कर चुके हैं और अब बंगलौर और कलकत्ता में सम्मेलन करने जा रहे हैं उसी प्रकार से दिल्ली में भी तथा जिला और ब्लाक और पंचायत लेवल पर गांव वालों को अधिकार दें जिससे भ्रष्टाचार पर नियंत्रण किया जा सके । तीन चार रोज पहले प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपना दिल खोलकर बात कही और अपनी आदत के अनुसार कहा कि अपोजीशन पंचायती राज स्थापित करने में रुकावट डाल रहा है । मान्यवर, आप आंध्र प्रदेश से आते हैं और जानते हैं कि आंध्र प्रदेश में पंचायती राज की स्थापना की गई है । जिला परिषदों के चुनाव और मंडलों के चुनाव डायरेक्ट होते हैं और कर्नाटक राज्य में भी जहां से हमारी बहिन जी आती हैं वहां भी डिस्ट्रिक्ट गवर्नमेंट के चुनाव भी डायरेक्ट होते हैं । इसलिए मुझे इस बात से खुशी होगी अगर आन्ध्र प्रदेश और कर्नाटक की भांति दिल्ली तथा देश में भी पंचायती राज दिल्ली के ब्लोकों और गांवों तक पहुंचा दिया जाय । इससे गांवों के... **(व्यवधान)**...गुजरात में होगा । बहुत खुशी की बात है । मैं स्वीकार कर लूंगा अगर आप कर रहे हैं ।

वित्त मंत्रालय में व्यय विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री बी० के० गढवी) : गुजरात में लेडीज का रिजर्वेशन है पंचायतों में ।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : यह रिजर्वेशन तो और जगह भी किया हुआ है । मान्यवर, अगर इस प्रकार आप करेंगे तो मुझे इसकी प्रसन्नता होगी रियल सेंस में, सही दिशा में अगर सही कदम होगा तो मैं उसकी प्रशंसा करूंगा । मैं उपलब्धि की बात स्वीकार करता हूं । देश में 17 प्रतिशत कृषि उत्पादन में वृद्धि हुई है । लेकिन कुदरत के कारण ।

कृषि मंत्रालय में कृषि और सहकारिता विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री श्याम लाल यादव): यह कैसे हो सकता है ।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : आप इसको अपने ऊपर लेते हैं ? अगर इस वर्ष कृषि उत्पादन की उपलब्धि आप अपने ऊपर लेना चाहते हैं तो लें दिल खोलकर । लेकिन पिछले चार सालों में जो भयंकर सूखा था उसको भी आपको अपने ऊपर

लेना होगा । जब से आपकी सरकार आई है 1985 से तो 1985 में सूखा, 1986 में सूखा, 1987 में सूखा, और 1988 में सूखा । तो इस सूखे की जो मार हैं उसको भी स्वीकार कीजियेगा । अगर आप इसको अपने ऊपर लेते हैं तो उसको भी लें । मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह कुदरत को देने है । माननीय, मुझे इस बात की शिकायत है कि सरकार ने 20 लाख टन गेहूं मंगाया, 8 लाख टन चावल मंगाया, इतनी चीनी मंगाई, खाद्य तेल मंगाया, सरकार सारी चीजें विदेशों से मंगाती है । जो 20 लाख टन गेहूं मंगाया है, कृषि मंत्री जो यहां पर उपस्थित हैं । आपने 20 लाख टन गेहूं अमेरिका से मंगाया । गुजरात, जहां के माननीय मंत्री जो चले गये, उन्होंने उसको उठाने से मना कर दिया । हर किसी ने उस गेहूं को उठाना मना कर दिया क्योंकि वह गेहूं बहुत खराब था । वह गेहूं कमजोर लिंगों को दिया जा रहा है ताकि उसका आटा बनाकर लोगों को खिला सकें । तो क्या यह हेल्थ हेजार्ड नहीं है, क्या यह स्वास्थ्य के लिये खतरनाक नहीं है । मैं कृषि मंत्री जी से आपके माध्यम से पूछना चाहता हूं कि जो 20 लाख टन गेहूं अमेरिका से मंगाया गया क्या वह पूरा का पूरा खराब नहीं था ? इसको मंगाने की जिम्मेदारी किसकी है ? इसको स्टेट ट्रेडिंग कार्पोरेशन ने मंगाया या किसने मंगाया ? किसने इसकी क्वालिटी को प्रमाणित किया था ? किसके ऊपर आपने जिम्मेदारी डाली है । आपने साढ़े छह सौ करोड़ रुपये का गेहूं मंगाया, आपने से मेरा मतलब है कृषि मंत्री जी से, इन्होंने उर्वरक का भी आयात किया जब कि साढ़े चौंतीस फीसदी उर्वरक के उत्पादन में वृद्धि हुई है और चार साल से लगातार भयंकर सूखा पड़ने के कारण, पिछले साल अभूतपूर्व सूखा था और आपकी सारी खाद स्टोरों में भरी पड़ी थी। किसी ने खाद नहीं उठाई और देश में खाद का उत्पादन भी ज्यादा हुआ। लेकिन तब भी आप विदेशों से उर्वरक का आयात करते हैं । ऐसी जानकारी मुझे है । ऐसा लगने लगा है कि भारत सरकार की यह आदत हो गई है कि बगैर कोई चीज बाहर से मंगाये, उनको ऐसा लगता है कि काम चलने वाला नहीं है । इसीलिये उन्होंने उर्वरक भी बाहर से मंगाया जब कि यहां वह पड़े-पड़े खराब हो रहा है । इसीलिये उन्होंने 10 फीसदी कम मूल्य पर उसकी बिक्री की । कुछ बातें थी जिनकी मैं प्रशंसा करना चाहता था और मैंने प्रशंसा की । लेकिन कुछ शिकायतें हैं कि कुछ विषयों की तरफ आदरणीय राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने देश की जनता का ध्यान आकर्षित नहीं किया । एक विषय, माननीय, यह है कि पूर्व राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने इस सरकार की नीति और पालिसियों के अनुसार सेंट्रल हाल में यह घोषणा की थी कि यह देश गरीबों का है। यह देश गांवों का है । देश के निर्धन लोगों को सस्ता, सुलभ और उनके दरवाजे पर न्याय दिया जाएगा माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने इसकी कोई चर्चा भी नहीं की । क्या आपकी नीति बदल गई ? जसवंत सिंह आयोग ने चार साल पहले अपनी रिपोर्ट दी थी लेकिन वह रद्दी की टोकरी में पड़ी है । पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में हाई कोर्ट की बेंच स्थापित करने के लिए रिपोर्ट दी थी मैं यह नहीं कहता कि कहां स्थापित की जाए । न्याय की तराजू आपके हाथ में लीजियेगा कि कहां जनता को अधिक सुविधा होगी । जहां पर मुकदमे हों, जहां लोगों को अधिक सुविधा मिलती हो वहां आप स्थापित करें लेकिन इस देश की गरीब जनता को सस्ता न्याय प्राप्त हो सके जो आपने वायदा किया था उसको आप पूरा कीजिये । यह नीति जब श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी प्रधानमन्त्री बनी थी सन 1977 में वह मेरठ गई थीं मेरठ की विशाल जनसभा में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने घोषणा की थी कि मेरठ में हाई कोर्ट की बेंच स्थापित की जाएगी । माननीय, यही नहीं हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री श्री राजीव गांधी जिस समय कांग्रेस के महामन्त्री थे मेरठ की जिला बार एसोसियेशन की मीटिंग में गये और उसमें उन्होंने घोषणा की कि तुम्हारी मांग न्यायोचित है और मेरठ में हाई कोर्ट की बेंच स्थापित होगी । इन्दिरा जी आश्वासन दे चुकी हैं, राजीव गांधी आश्वासन दे चुके हैं अब महात्मा गांधी को हम कहां से लाएं उन आश्वासनों को पूरा कराने के

[श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा]

लिए वह तो हमारे बस की बात नहीं है । आपके माध्यम से इन दो मन्त्रियों को मैं यह बता देना चाहता हूं कि 12 करोड़ के करीब उत्तर प्रदेश की आबादी है । इलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट में 2 लाख केस लम्बित पड़े हुए हैं और सारे देश में साढ़े छः लाख के करीब केस पेंडिंग पड़े हुए हैं यह केस 10-15-20 सालों से पेंडिंग पड़े हुए हैं मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि कौन इसका इन्तजाम करेगा, कौन इसकी व्यवस्था करेगा ? क्या इस तरीके से सस्ता, सुलभ न्याय मिल सकेगा ?

माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में परिवार नियोजन के बारे में एक भी शब्द नहीं कहा है । क्या यह कार्य पूरा हो चुका है ? परिवार नियोजन पर जितना रुपया अभी खर्च होता है उससे शहर के पढ़े लिखे आदमियों ने फायदा उठाया है । गांवों में जहां उसकी ज्यादा जरूरत है परिवार नियोजन से गांवों के गरीब आदमी अभी तक लाभान्वित नहीं हो सके हैं । इसके बारे में जब प्रधान मन्त्री जी अपना जवाब देंगे तो जरूर चर्चा करें कि क्या हमने यह काम पूरा कर लिया है परिवार नियोजन का या अभी पूरा नहीं किया है तो फिर इसकी चर्चा अभिभाषण में क्यों नहीं की गई ?

जहां तक खेलों का सम्बन्ध है, अभी माननीया बहन जी बहुत लम्बा भाषण दे कर चली गई मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि सियोल में क्या हुआ ? जीरो । जीरो बटा जीरा । हमारे यहां कहते हैं जीरो बटा लड्डू । यह तो कहते है कि हमने दिल्ली में एशियन खेल आयोजित किये परमेश्वर करे आपके यहां ओलम्पिक खेल भी आयोजित हो जाएं लेकिन गेम्ज कराने से क्या फायदा । हमें अपने लड़कों को तैयार करने से काम चलेगा जिससे हम चीन की तरह, साउथ कोरिया की तरह अपना स्थान खेलों में भी स्थोपित कर सकें । हमारे यहां इतनी बड़ी पापुलेशन होने के बावजूद भी हमारा कोई स्थान दुनियां के खेलों के नक्शे पर नहीं है । इसकी कोई चर्चा राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में नहीं की ।

उद्योगों के प्रबन्ध में श्रमिकों की साझेदारी होगी । अब से ठीक 12 साल पेश्तर तत्कालीन प्रधान मन्त्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने घोषणा की थी कि 20 सूत्री कार्यक्रम में 1976 में कि उद्योगों में श्रमिकों को भागीदार बनाया जाएगा । 12 साल हो चुके हैं मन्त्री जी मेरी बात को नोट कर लें और प्रधान मन्त्री उत्तर देते समय बताएंगे कि कौन से निजी अथवा सरकारी उद्योगों में श्रमिकों को भागीदार बनाया है एक एक उद्योग के विषय मे बताएंगे और यह भी बताएं कि किन किन उद्योगों में क्या क्या एग्रीमेंट है । कब तक बनाने का उनका प्रोग्राम है । मान्यवर, सारे हिंदुस्तान की विभिन्न प्रदेश सरकारों की मांग पर सरकारिया आयोग का गठन हुआ था । उसने अपनी संस्तुतियां दीं । आपके पक्ष में दी, देश के पक्ष में दी, जो उचित समझीं दे दीं लेकिन सरकारिया आयोग की रिपोर्ट भी रद्दी की टोकरी में पड़ी है और एक हर्फ भी सरकारिया आयोग के बारे में राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने सम्बोधन में नहीं कहा । मान्यवर, रंगनाथ मिश्रा आयोग था । कई साल पहले रंगनाथ मिश्रा आयोग रिपोर्ट दे चुका है, उसकी संस्तुतियां मौजूद हैं, किसी के खिलाफ एक्शन लिया गया, जिन दोषी लोगों ने नरसंहार किया था दिल्ली के अंदर 5 हजार आदमियों को मारा था, मेरठ, कानपुर और जबलपुर में भी मारे गये थे ? रंगनाथ मिश्रा आयोग की संस्तुतियों के ऊपर क्या कार्यवाही की ? क्यों नहीं राष्ट्रपति जी ने चर्चा की कि हम कार्यवाही करेंगे । फिर आयोग क्यों बैठाया गया था ? क्यों कार्यवाही नहीं की ? कब तक करने का इरादा है इसको भी माननीय मंत्री जी बताने की कृपा करें ।

कृषि मंत्री जी यहां उपस्थित हैं । प्रति वर्ष एक हजार करोड़ या इससे भी अधिक की क्षति बाढ़ से देश की फसलों को, मकानों को, जानवरों को, सड़कों को और जानों को होती है । कई सौ आदमी प्रति-वर्ष बाढ़ के कारण मरते हैं । करोड़ों रुपये की फसल बरबाद हो जाती है, मकान और सड़कें बरबाद हो जाती हैं । माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने इसकी भी चर्चा

नहीं की कि कोई स्थायी व्यवस्था करने का उनका ईरादा है । अतः बाढ़ को रोकने के लिए कोई योजना है या नहीं इस पर बतायें, चाहे कृषि मंत्री जी बतायें या प्रधान मंत्री जी ।

अखबार में हमने जोधपुर के कैदियों के बारे में पढ़ा । पिछले 4 साल से है, दोषी हैं तो मुकदमा चलाइये और निर्दोष हैं तो उनको छोड़िए,। न्याय पर आधारित हमारी सरकार और हमारा संविधान है । अगर दोषी हैं तो कानून के अनुसार उन पर मुकदमा चलाइये, निर्दोष है तो उनको छोड़िए । क्यों उनकी चर्चा नहीं की कि छोड़ रहे हैं ।

चरित्र निर्माण । मान्यवर, माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने सम्बोधन के पृष्ठ 13 पर कहा है कि नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक मूल्य दांव पर हैं, राष्ट्रपति जी खुद कह रहे हैं और जब नैतिक मूल्य, आध्यात्मिक मूल्य या सब प्रकार के नैतिक मूल्य समझ लीजिए दांव पर हैं तो चरित्र निर्माण की तरफ सरकार क्या कदम उठाने जा रही है । मुझ तो ऐसा लगता है कि यहां आदमी अपने परिवार की परवाह करता है, देश की नहीं और देश वही तरक्की करता है जहां लोग देश की परवाह करते हैं परिवार की परवाह बाद में करते है । लेकिन आज चाहे राजनीतिज्ञ हैं, चाहे व्यापारी हैं, चाहे उद्योगपति हैं, चाहे सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, कोई भी हैं, अपने परिवार की पहले परवाह करते हैं देश की बाद में, जबकि होना यह चाहिए—अगर हमारा चरित्र निर्मित हो जाये—कि हम पहले देश की परवाह करेंगे और परिवार उसके बाद में आयेगा ।

मान्यवर, क्या राष्ट्रपति जी ने मिलावट की चर्चा की । आप सारे संसार में चले जाइये, कहीं मिलावट नहीं मिलेगी और आप को अपने देश में कोई चीज शुद्ध और पवित्र नहीं मिलेगी । हर चीज में आपको मिलावट मिलेगी । क्यों नहीं मिलावट को दूर करने के लिए राष्ट्रपति जी ने घोषणाएं की ।

जहां तक, मान्यवर, कालेधन की बात है, यह ब्लैक मनी किस कदर तेजी के साथ इस देश में बढ़ती चली जा रही हैं । रोकने की कोई कोशिश है । बताइये । कितना कालाधन है इस पर एक रिपोर्ट बनी थी । बताया गया 37,000 करोड़, किसी ने बताया 40,000 करोड़ । हर साल इतना बढ़ जाता हैं। मान्यवर, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार तक यह पहुंचाना चाहता हूं कि जब तक काले धन पर नियंत्रण नहीं होगा, तब तक न देश में भ्रष्टाचार रुकेगा और न देश में महंगाई रुकेगी और न बढ़ती हुई प्राइसेज रुकेगी ।

इसलिए आप यह बतायें कि इस काले धन को रोकने के लिए आप क्या कोशिश कर रहे हैं ? क्यों आपने उसमें ब्लैक मनी की चर्चा नहीं की ? क्या काला धन देश की समस्या नहीं है ? इस देश की गिरावट करने में काले धन का बहुत बड़ा योगदान है ।

मान्यवर, यह देश गरीबों का देश हैं, यह देश गांव के लोगों का है और स्व० चौधरी चरण सिंह जी गांव के रहने वाले थे, गरीब परिवार में जन्म लिया था । वह गांव के लोगों के लिए ही आवाज उठाते थे और गरीबों के लिए आवाज उठाते थे । उनका किसान घाट बने, पर एक नया पैसा खर्च करने का भी तो सरकार ने इरादा नहीं किया । क्यो ? वह तो स्वतन्त्रता संग्राम सैनानी भी थे । उनकी ईमानदारी और चरित्र की भी छाप है । किसान घाट के लिए सरकार ने जगह भी दी, तो किसान घाट का निर्माण करवाने की तरफ सरकार ने क्यों नहीं सोचा—यह मेरी बड़ी भारी शिकायत हैं। पवन कुमार बंसल जी यहां पर बैठे हैं—पता नहीं क्यो मुझ से नाराज हो रहे थे जब मैंने कहा कि थोड़ी सी भ्रष्टाचार समाप्त करने की भी तो चर्चा कर दो । पता नहीं क्या-क्या कहने लगे । आपकी आज्ञा से कहना चाहता हूं, कि मैं जीवन भर भ्रष्टाचार का जानी दुश्मन रहा हूं और रहूंगा । मैंने अपने जीवन में खून के

[श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा]

कतरे की कीमत—पब्लिक के एक पैसे के मुकाबले में—कम समझी है ।

यह दुर्भाग्य है कि इस देश में भ्रष्टाचार आसमान को छूने लगा है । भ्रष्टाचार की हम चर्चा करते है, किसी आदमी के खिलाफ नहीं कहना चाहते—अब श्रीमती माग्रेट अल्वा तो न जाने किस-किस की बाबत क्या कह गई—पर मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूं । यह उचित नहीं है, मैं ऐसे बोलना नहीं चाहता, मैं इस प्रकार से बोला नहीं करता, लेकिन अगर देश के रक्षा सौदों में—चाहे बोफोर्स की तोपें हों, चाहे पनडुब्बियों की खरीद हो और चाहे सुमीतोमो, जो जापानी फर्म है के (ज्योत्सना होल्डिंग) प्राकृतिक तेल व गैस कमीशन के सौदे हों—रक्षा सौदों में भ्रष्टाचार किया जाए—कौन भ्रष्टाचार करे, इसे मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूं ।

श्री हेच० हनुमनतप्पा (कर्णाटक) : रेवती और मधुबन के बारे में आप क्या कहेंगे ?

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : यह तय किया गया कि कमीशन एजेन्ट नहीं होगा, यह तय किया गया कि बिचौलिये नहीं होंगे, कमीशन नहीं दिया जाएगा और सन् 1986 में 64 करोड़ का तो सभी ने मान लिया कि 64 करोड़ रुपया दिया गया है । चाहे 64 पैसे दिये गये हों, एक नया पैसा भी इस गरीब देश का अगर बतौर कमीशन जाता है, तो उसे बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जाना चाहिए, अगर आपको भ्रष्टाचार रोकना है । और यहां तो रक्षा सौदों में भ्रष्टाचार है ।

यहां तक, मान्यवर, मुझे एक शिकायत है, सन् 1953 ई० में जब स्व० जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री थे, उनके आदेशानुसार काका कालेलकर का पिछड़े वर्ग के ऊपर एक कमीशन बना । उसकी रिपोर्ट रद्दी की टोकरी में, फिर मंडल आयोग बना, उसकी रिपोर्ट भी रद्दी की टोकरी में है । एक अक्षर भी तो, राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने, मंडल आयोग की बाबत नहीं कहा कि हम क्या करने का इरादा रखते हैं—रद्दी की टोकरी में हमेशा के लिए डाल रहे हैं या उस पर भी विचार करेंगे—इसकी भी कोई चर्चा नहीं की है ।

मान्यवर, मैं अपनी कुछ चिंताएं व्यक्त करके समाप्त करता हूं । फिर, मान्यवर, बुरा लगेगा—राज्यपालों की नियुक्तियां माननीय स्व० जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के जमाने में उच्च कोटि के व्यक्तियों को राज्यपाल बनाया जाता था, निष्पक्ष व्यक्तियों को राज्यपाल बनाया जाता था । और आज जिन्हें जनता तिरस्कार कर देती है, जिन्हें चुनाव में नाकामयाब कर देती है, उन्हें आज राज्यपाल बनाया जा रहा है या भारत सरकार के डिप्टी मिनिस्टर भारत सरकार के स्टेट मिनिस्टर जो नाकामयाब हो जाते हैं उन्हें हटाते हैं और उन्हें स्टेट्स के मुख्यमंत्रियों के ऊपर राज्यपाल बनाकर भेजते है । देश की एकता की खातिर, देश की अखंडता की खातिर इस देश में संघीय राज्य है और अलग अलग पार्टियों की हुकूमत है, आवश्यक है देश की एकता और अखंडता की खातिर कि हम ऐसा मौका न दें कि लोगों में आपस में अविश्वास पैदा हो, इसलिए निष्पक्ष और योग्यतम व्यक्तियों को ही राज्यपाल नियुक्त किया जाए । मान्यवर, यहां पंजाब की समस्या की चर्चा है । माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक स्वर में बगैर रुके यह कह दिया कि सारी अपोजीशन टेरोरिस्ट्स को सपोर्ट कर रही है । मुझे अत्यन्त दुख है ।

श्री पवन कुमार बांसल (पंजाब) : यह सुनते भी सही नहीं और देखते भी सही नहीं ।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : मुझे जरा बोलने दें जब बहिन जी माननीया माग्रेट बोल रहीं थीं तो व्यक्तियों पर अटैक कर रही थीं और हम चुप थे । लेकिन मैं कम से कम आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे दल के जो प्रेजीडेंट थे होशियारपुर जिले के बलबीर सिंह जो एम०पी० भी यहां रह चुके थे, उनका कत्ल हुआ । कांग्रेस के कत्ल हुये, सी०पी०आई०

और सी०पी०एम० के कत्ल हुये तथा बी०जे०पी० के कत्ल हुये और कहना एक जरा सा यह, जरा सी इतनी . . . (चुटकी) सब टेरोरिस्ट्स को इमदाद कर रहे हैं। कत्ल भी हो जायें और टेरोरिस्ट्स की इमदाद भी करें ? भाई, मैं तो गांव की तरह का आदमी हूं मेरा वैसा ख्याल है, इसलिए उचित यही होगा कि आपको खुद सोचना चाहिये। पंजाब के मामले में यह सरकार असफल रही है। 79 आदमी मरे थे, जिस समय आपके सुरजीत सिंह बरनाला की सरकार थी और 12 मई, 1987 से और अब पहली जनवरी तक 2,688 आदमी मर चुके हैं। सारे निर्दोष और बेगुनाह लोग हैं। मुझे दुख और अफसोस इस बात का है कि सरकार ने एलान किया था फेंसिंग करने का, बाड़ लगाने का बंगाल की तरफ भी और पंजाब की तरफ भी, कितने में बाड़ लगी है। क्या अब टैरोरिस्ट्स नहीं आ रहे हैं, क्या स्मगलिंग नहीं हो रही है, क्या हथियार नहीं आ रहे हैं और क्या पाकिस्तानी रेंजर्स हिन्दुस्तान की सरजमीन में घुस कर हथियारों के साथ टैरोरिस्ट्स को यहां भेज रहे हैं या नहीं भेज रहे हैं ? मेरे पास अखबार है और यह रहा कटिंग। पकड़े भी जाते हैं, भेजे भी जाते हैं। जम्मू-काश्मीर में आ गए और मैं फिर भी कहता हूं कि परमेश्वर करे हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कोशिश मे पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान दोनों भाई हों जायें। मैं तो भाई मानता हूं, जो कल तक भाई थे, ईश्वर करे आगे भी भाई हो जायें। उनमें प्रेमपूर्वक और मधुर संबंध स्थापित हो जायें और प्रधान मंत्री की कोशिश सफल हो। लेकिन बावजूद इसके पाकिस्तान आज भी हथियार भेज रहा है और आतंकवादियों को ट्रेनिंग दे रहा है और काश्मीर में जो कुछ कर रहा है वह सर्वविदित ही है।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हेच हनमनतप्पा) पीठासीन हुए।]

मान्यवर, देश में अराजकता, देश में सांप्रदायिकता बढ़ी। तीन करोड़ इंसानों की तबाही और बर्बादी हुई जब देश का विभाजन हुआ उससे बड़ी तबाही और बर्बादी आज तक सारे ससार में कहीं नहीं हुई। महात्मा गांधी की कुरबानी तीन करोड़ इंसानों की कुरबानी के बावजूद भी अगर हिन्दुस्तान के आदमी सांप्रदायिकता से सबक लिए बगैर और यहां रोजाना सांप्रदायिकता के आधार पर झगड़े होते रहे तो यह हमारे देश के लिए कलंक की बात है। साप्रदायिकता भी बढ़ रही है, अराजकता भी बढ़ रही है, इनको रोकने में भी सरकार असफल है। इसे रोकने की कोशिश की जाए। दूरदर्शन और आकाशवाणी का प्रयोग जो केवल आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता राजनीतिक कार्यों के लिए बढ़ता जा रहा है उसे रोका जाए। निष्पक्षता के आधार पर निगम बनाकर उसका उपयोग किया जाय और अनुत्पादक खर्चे, सभी कहते हैं, प्रधानमंत्री रोज कह रहे हैं, अनुत्पादक खर्चे घटाए जाएं, नोन-प्लान खर्चे घटाए जाएं। लेकिन, मान्यवर, यह 54,347 करोड रुपए, जब बजट पर मौका लगा तब बोलूगा लेकिन नोन प्लान, जिसे कहा जाता है--आयोजना भिन्न व्यय, 54,347 करोड़ रुपए, माननीय श्याम लाल जी और भजन लाल जी ध्यान देंगे, कि नोन योजना पर 54,347 करोड़ रुपए और योजना पर 27,814 करोड़ रुपए यानी योजना पर आधा और नोन योजना पर दुगुना। तो आप इसे घटाकर योजना पर बढ़ाईए और नोन-योजना को कम कीजिए। यह भी मेरा अनुरोध है।

बेरोजगारी. माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने बेरोजगारी की चर्चा तो की, लेकिन जितनों को रोजगार देते हैं, उससे ज्यादा बेरोजगार हो जाते हैं। यह गांवों का देश है, गांव का पढ़ा-लिखा आदमी बेकार ठोकरें खाता फिरता है, उसे रोजगार मिलता नहीं। आप रोजगार दीजिएगा और इसलिये रिकार्ड रखिएगा कि कितना हम करेंगे।

मान्यवर, शहरीकरण का बारहवें पेज पर है, माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा है, इसे आप देखिएगा, शहरीकरण के संबंध में राष्ट्रीय आयोग की रिपोर्ट विचाराधीन है। गांधी जी तो ग्रामीणीकरण कहते थे, अब यहां शहरीकरण आयोग की रिपोर्ट सरकार के विचाराधीन है। मैं कहूंगा कि आप कोशिश करें कि ग्रामीणीकरण हो,

[श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा

ग्राम-स्वराज्य स्थापित करें और गांधी जी के सपने पूरे करें ।

इन्हीं चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि मुझे यह विश्वास है, मुझे यह उम्मीद है कि मेरी बातों को नोट किया गया होगा और इसमें जो रचनात्मक बातें इन्हें नजर पड़ें, उसके ऊपर प्रधानमंत्री जी या कोई भी उत्तर देते समय जवाब देने की कृपा करेंगे, मैं इनका आभारी होऊंगा । धन्यवाद ।

कृषि मंत्री (श्री भजन लाल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी ने दोनों सदनों के ज्वायंट सेसन में जो अपना अभिभाषण दिया और जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव यहां पर माननीय पी० एन० सुकुल साहब ने रखा, मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश का आधार प्रजातांत्रिक मूल्यों पर आधारित है। हमारे देश ने पिछले 40-41 सालों में जो कुछ किया, वह सारी दुनियां के सामने है। जब राष्ट्रपति अपना अभिभाषण देते हैं तो उसमें अतीत, वर्तमान और भविष्य के बारे में चिंतन होता है, उस पर हमें विचार करना चाहिए। यह हमारा समय जो गया है, कैसा गया है, जो चल रहा है, वह कैसा है और भविष्य के बारे में हमें क्या सोचना है और किस तरह से इस देश का निर्माण करके इस देश को सुदृढ़ मजबूत करना है और आगे बढ़ाना है? इन बातों पर चिंतन करने की आवश्यकता है।

4.00 P.M.

आप जानते हैं कि प्रजातंत्र में, प्रजातांत्रिक प्रणाली में अपोजीशन का भी एक रोल होता है और सरकारी बैंचों पर बैठे हुए जो हम लोग हैं, हमारा भी एक कर्तव्य होता है अपोजीशन को आलोचना करने का अधिकार है। यदि कोई सही आलोचना हो तो उसे करने का उनको अधिकार है। लेकिन जिस बात का कोई सिर पैर न हो, जिसका कोई आधार नहीं हो और अगर वे सही बात को भी सही नहीं कहें तो वह सही नहीं है। महोदय, यह बहुत ही पवित्र हाउस है और इसमें जो वाक्य लिख हुए हैं उन्हें आप देखेंगे, उसमें लिखा हुआ है कि, सदन में जो प्रवेश करे तो सत्य और सच्चाई की बात कहे। अगर सच और सच्चाई की बात नहीं कहे तो उससे तो अच्छा यही है कि बोले नहीं। लेकिन आज हम सारी मर्यादा ताक पर रख देते हैं जब अपनी बात कहना शुरू करते हैं। सच्चाई से बहुत परे चले जाते हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं यहां पर, बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने यहां पर कहा कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में कुछ भी नहीं है। इसमें कोई सार नहीं है। इसमें कोई डवलपमेंट की बात नहीं है। इसमें देश की नीति की कोई चर्चा नहीं है। महोदय, यदि आप इस अभिभाषण को गहराई से पढ़ें तो आप पाएंगे कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने एक-एक बात बहुत ही गहराई में जाकर कही है। अगर मैं कहूं कि सारी बातों का निचोड़ दिया है, तो गलत बात नहीं होगी। अपोजीशन ने एक ऐसी परंपरा बना ली है। मैं यदि यह कहूं कि अपोजीशन एक अंधविश्वास की भावना से ग्रस्त है तो उन्हें गुस्सा महसूस होगा। यदि अपोजीशन कोई अच्छा सुझाव दे, या कंस्ट्रक्टिव बात कहे तब तो समझ में आ सकती है, लेकिन इनके पास सिवाय आलोचना के और कहने के लिए कोई मुद्दा ही नहीं है।

अभी वीरेन्द्र वर्मा साहब एग्रीकल्चर की चर्चा कर रहे थे। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते है कि पिछले चार सालों से हमारे मुल्क में भयंकर सूखा पड़ा। सूखा तो प्राकृतिक विपत्ति है। उस पर सरकार का कोई वश ही नहीं चलता। लेकिन देखना यह है कि सरकार की नीति, प्रोग्राम्स या सरकार की पालिसी कैसी है? कहीं उसकी गलत नीतियों की वजह से नुकसान तो नहीं हो गया। अगर हमारे देश की नीति गलत होती तो चार साल इतना भयंकर सूखा पड़ने

की वजह से हिंदुस्तान का उत्पादन बहुत ही कम हो सकता था। कितना कम होता इसका अंदाजा लगाना कठिन है। अमेरिका में पिछले एक साल से सूखा है और सिर्फ एक साल के सूखे की वजह से केवल अकेले अमेरिका में ही नहीं सारी दुनिया पर इसका असर पड़ा है। यह सिर्फ एक साल के सूखे की वजह से है और हिंदुस्तान में 4 साल सूखा पड़ने के बावजूद हमारे देश के उत्पादन में नाम मात्र की कमी आई है, सिर्फ 4 परसेंट की। हमारे देश में 1983-84 में ज्यादा-से-ज्यादा उत्पादन 152 मिलियन टन हुआ था और वर्ष 1987-88 में भयंकर सूखा पड़ने के बावजूद उत्पादन 138 मिलियन टन से कम नहीं हुआ। मुश्किल से 4 परसेंट की कमी आई इस दफा। हमने ऐसे प्रोग्राम्स बनाए, स्पेशल फूड ग्रेन उत्पादन के प्रोग्राम बनाए। इन्द्र देवता की भी कृपा रही, उन्होंने भी साथ दिया। अच्छे मौके पर बरसात हुई। बरसात होने की वजह से, सरकार की नीतियों की वजह से, किसान को अच्छी खाद, अच्छे बीज देने की वजह से फसल अच्छी हुई। हमारे साइंटिस्ट्स ने भी बड़ा काम किया, हमारी यूनिवर्सिटीज ने भी बड़ा काम किया, हमारी राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंकों ने किसान को उनकी सुविधा के लिए-ट्यूब वैल लगाने, ट्रैक्टर लेने, खाद लेने बीज लेने के लिए हर तरह की सुविधा बैंकों ने दी है। उसी का नतीजा है कि हमने 166 मिलियन टन अनाज उत्पादन का जो टार्गेट रखा था, इस दफा हमारी उम्मीद है कि 166 नहीं बल्कि 170 मिलियन टन से ज्यादा इस साल देश में उत्पादन होगा। अभी, वीरेन्द्र वर्मा जी कह रहे थे कि तेल भी बाहर से मंगाते हैं, गेहूं भी बाहर से मंगाते हैं। बहुत सी चीजों का उन्होंने जिक्र किया। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते है कि जब सूखा पड़ जाए तो बहुत-सी चीजें मंगानी पड़ जाती हैं। कुछ चीजें मजबूरी में भी मंगानी पड़ती हैं। दूसरे मुल्कों के साथ आदान-प्रदान बिजनेस के कुछ एग्रीमेंट ऐसे होते हैं। कुछ एग्रीमेंट ऐसे होते हैं दूसरे मुल्कों के साथ कि कुछ चीजें हमारे मुल्क से वह ले हैं और कुछ चीजें या सामान उस मुल्क से हमें लेनी पड़ती हैं। जब सामान लेते हैं तो वह मुल्क कहता है कि हमारे पास सरप्लस गेहूं है, कोई कहता है कि हमारे पास सरप्लस खाद है, हम वही दे सकते हैं और जो चीज हम देते हैं उसकी उस मुल्क में जरूरत होती है, वह मुल्क वही हमसे लेता है। तो उसके बदले उस एग्रीमेंट के तहत हमें कुछ चीजें लेनी पड़ती हैं। लेकिन मैं बताना चाहता हूं सदन को, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय; आपके द्वारा कि पिछले साल हमने एक हजार करोड़ रुपए से भी ज्यादा का आयल सीड बाहर से मंगाया था, कोई तकरीबन साढ़े अठारह लाख टन के करीब, मगर इस दफा ऐसी हमारी उम्मीद है कि आधे से भी कम मुश्किल से मंगाना पड़ेगा, 500 करोड़ रुपए से कम का शायद मंगाना पड़े और हो सकता है न भी मंगाना पड़े। पिछले साल हमने पांच लाख गांठें रुई की बाहर से मंगाई, इस साल हमें उम्मीद है कि हमारे पास 10 लाख गांठें सरप्लस होंगी। इसी तरह से चीनी भी हमारे पास इस साल सरप्लस होगी। बाहर से मंगाने का सवाल नहीं पैदा होता। यह कोई छोटी उपलब्धि नहीं है। यह उपलब्धि कैसे हो पायी? यह उपलब्धि हमारे देश के उस महान नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल जी, जिन्होंने आधुनिक भारत की आधारशिला रखी थी और देश के सामने अपनी नीतियां रखी थीं कि देश को आगे कैसे ले जाना है, कैसे बढ़ाना है और किस तरह के प्रोग्राम देश के सामने रखने हैं। पंडित जी ने, आप जानते हैं, कितने ही भाखड़ा बांध जैसे अनेकों बांध इस देश में बनाए, कितने बड़े-बड़े खाद के कारखाने, बिजली के तापघर, कितनी बड़ी-बड़ी यूनिवर्सिटियां, किसानों को सारी सुविधाएं दी, अच्छा भाव किसानों को दिया। आप जानते हैं कि देश के आजाद होने से पहले सूखा पड़ने की वजह से अनाज की कमी के कारण लाखों आदमी भूख से मर गये सड़कों पर, लेकिन चार साल का सूखा पड़ने के बावजूद एक भी आदमी भूख से नहीं मरा, यह कोई छोटी उपलब्धि नहीं है। यही नहीं मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता

[श्री भजन लाल]

हूं कि पिछले तीन सालों में हमने दाई हजार करोड़ रुपए के करीब जहां ड्राउट आ गया वहां हमने सहायता की है और 13 सौ करोड़ रुपए के करीब हमने जहां फ्लड आ गया वहां उनकी सहायता की है ताकि ज्यादा से ज्यादा सुख और सुविधाएं मुसीबत के समय लोगों को दी जायें, लेकिन आप जानते है कि ये हम तभी दे सकते हैं जब हमारा देश मजबूत होगा और देश तभी मजबूत होता है जब सारे देश के लोग देश की एकता और अखण्डता के लिए काम करते हैं। यहां पर बहुत सारे भाइयों ने बोलते हुये खासकर उग्रवाद का भी जिक्र किया, देश को कमजोर करने का भी जिक्र किया। मैं किसी पर इल्जाम नहीं लगाना चाहता, सारे के सारे सम्मानित सदस्य हैं। गुरुपदस्वामी भी यहां बैठे हैं, वे बड़े सीनियर लीडर हैं, उनकी पार्टी के श्री राम जेठमलानी और इस हाउस के मेम्बर हैं, चण्डीगढ़ में गए और प्रेस कांफ्रेंस में बुलाकर उन्होंने कहा, मैं इल्जाम लगाता हूं, चैलेंज के साथ, गलत हो तो चैलेंज करें इस बात को, वहां पर एक प्रेस कांफ्रेंस में कहा है, सारे पेपर्स में छपा है कोई पर्दे की बात नहीं है, कि खालिस्तान की बात को मान लेना चाहिये . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): He is unnecessarily raising this issue again. May I tell my friend that Shri Ram Jethmalani has denied this totally. What he had said in that Press Conference and also subsequently was that the Government of India had encouraged terrorism in Punjab and the extremists have been the result of this terrorism because of the Government of India's policy and its approach to Punjab problem. Secondly, he has said that he stands firmly with the view that India is one and that Punjab should be a part of the Indian Union. He has not said that he is for Khalistan or that he is for separatists. He has not supported the terrorist. On the contrary, he has found fault with the Government of India in this regard.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He should come and explain, what does he mean by "autonomous Khalistan within the Union of India"? What do you infer from this?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: What does it mean? It is Indian Union. India is a Federation. I think, my friend knows the language. India is a Federation.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He has not said anything of that nature. What he says has serious portents of secession...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: India is a Federation.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: His statement has very serious portents of secession and balkanisation of the country...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He stands by the Constitution. India is a Federation...

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I have a booklet which he has published. I will just read out.....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Let us not go into that point, Mr. Bansal.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: It says: "No alternative to an autonomous State."

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He has said that the Prime Minister called Bhindranwale a saint, (*Interruptions*) Bhindranwale has been described by Rajiv Gandhi as a saint. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): I want one clarification from Mr. Gurupadaswamy. Why is Mr. Jethmalani feeling shy of coming to the House? Why are you doing the explanation on his behalf?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He is appearing in a case in Bombay.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Let him come...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He will come. He will certainly come.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He says: "....there being no alternative to the formation of an autonomous State within India."..... "An autonomous State" as different from other States...

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: He has also sent a telegram to the Prime Minister day before yesterday. It has been published in the "Indian Express"

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: I know what it is—a language of gutter in the telegram... (*Interruptions*)

श्री भजन लाल : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, गुरुपदस्वामी जी बहुत सीनियर मेम्बर हैं, हम उनकी इज्जत करते हैं । या तो इन्होंने पूरे पेपर पढे नहीं, या इनकी उनसे बात नहीं हुई । अगर इनसे बात हो जाती जेठमलानी जी से तो शायद ये ऐसी बात नहीं कहते । आपने तो ऐलिगेशन लगा दिया है । मैं कंट्रोवर्सी में नहीं पड़ना चाहता, लेकिन आपने तो एक ऐलिगेशन लगा दिया कि उग्रवाद को बढ़ावा भारत सरकार ने दिया है ।

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Ram Jethmalani is a red rag to you people. You cannot stop referring to him again and again.

श्री भजन लाल : हमें लाल चूहा नहीं लगता, आपको लगता होगा शेर । यह अगर आपको शेर लगता है तो यह कागजी शेर इन्हें हम कह सकते है । इस तरह की बात करने वालों को पार्टी तो कागज की नाव है, पता नहीं कब डूब जायेगी । मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि आपको अंधेरे में नहीं रहना चाहिये । जेठमलानी ने बाकायदा ओपनली कहा । आपने जो कहा कि उग्रवाद को भारत सरकार ने बढ़ावा दिया है, इस बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर अलगाववाद को बढ़ावा किसी ने दिया है तो आप 1977 का अकालियों का इलेक्शन मैनीफेस्टो को पढ़ लीजिए और आनन्दपुर साहब प्रस्ताव भी । अकालियों ने अपने इलेक्शन मैनीफेस्टो में कहा था कि उस वक्त कि एक अलग राष्ट्र बनना चाहिये । यह उनके इलेक्शन मैनीफैस्टो में है उनको सपोर्ट करने के लिए कौन आया ? जनता पार्टी के अध्यक्ष आए । उनको सपोर्ट करने के लिए आए बी०जे०पी० के अध्यक्ष, उनके सपोर्ट करने के लिए आए लोकदल के अध्यक्ष कि इनको वोट देकर अकालियों की सरकार बनाओ, इनको कामयाब करो । उनके सपोर्ट करने के कारण अकालियों की सरकार बनी और उसकी वजह से उग्रवाद वहां पनपा । जेठमलानी ने जो कुछ कहा है, इसको हम कंडेम करते है, ऐसा आपने एक दिन भी नही कहा । आपको कहना चाहिए था कि जेठमलानी जी ने जो कुछ कहा है, गलत कहा है, इनको हम पार्टी से निकालते हैं । आपने जेठमलानी को नोटिस दिया ? मैं सही बात कहता हूं . . . (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, again and again he is referring to him. Sir, I will pass on his article to him for his information. On 17-1-1988 Jethmalani has written an article—'Chandigarh Seminar: A ray of light' There he has categorically stated. (*Interruptions*).

श्री भजन लाल : वह खुद क्यों नहीं सफाई देते, उनको खुद को सफाई देनी चाहिए थी, आपने कभी उनकी आलोचना नहीं की । . . (**व्यवधान**) प्रधान मंत्री जी ने सब पार्टियों को नहीं कहा । आपकी देशभक्ति पर संदेह नही है लेकिन जो ऐसी बात करते हैं उनकी देशभक्ति पर संदेह होगा (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Why don't you read it? (*Interruptions*). He is as much a patriot as not said anything wrong? (*Interruptions*). He is as much a patriot as you are. Therefore, where is the question of criticising him.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab): To attack an individual

[Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora]
who is not present is, I think, totally wrong.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: He is in the habit of saying things and not being present in the House.

श्री भजन लाल : वह सदन के मैम्बर हैं । कोई सदन का मैम्बर नहीं हो उनके खिलाफ इल्जाम लगाऊं तो और बात है। क्योंकि वह सदन के मैम्बर हैं उनको डिफेंड करने का राईट है । मुझे चैलेंज करने का राइट है । उन्हें भी मुझे चैलेंज करने का राइट है । बाहर के किसी मैम्बर के बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना चाहिए और न मैंने कहा है । जो कुछ मैंने कहा वह हकीकत है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने किसी पार्टी के बारे में नहीं कहा । पार्टी के एक सदस्य के बारे में कहा तो आपने बवेला मचा दिया। प्रधान मंत्री ने कभी कोई ऐसी बात नहीं की। वीरेन्द्र वर्मा जी बोल रहे थे । बड़े सीनियर मैम्बर हैं । उन्होंने वी० पी० सिंह के बारे में चर्चा की । मुश्किल यह है कि जब तक कांग्रेस के साथ कोई आदमी रहता है तो वह बेइमान है, भ्रष्ट है, चोर है और जब उनकी साइड पर आकर बैठ जाता है तो वह आदमी एक ही रात में ईमानदार बन जाता है । वी० पी० सिंह और अरुण सिंह सारे ईमानदार हो गए ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हेच० हनुमनतप्पा) आप किसी का नाम न लीजिए ।

श्री भजन लाल : इन्होंने कहा इसलिए कह रहा हूं । इन्होंने रक्षा सौदे के बारे में कहा कि इसमें बड़ा भ्रष्टाचार हुआ है (व्यवधान)

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : एक अक्षर भी नहीं कहा नाम लेकर । आप एक का भी नाम बता दीजिए ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री हेच० हनुमनतप्पा): मैंने साफ कर दिया कि नाम लेने की जरूरत नहीं है । (व्यवधान)

श्री भजन लाल : मैंने आपका नाम नहीं लिया । मैंने अच्छे कहा आपको। मैंने आप पर कोई इल्जाम नहीं लगाया। मैंने गलत बात नहीं कही आप के बारे में । मैंने कहा कि वर्मा जी बहुत सीनियर मैम्बर हैं । बड़े काबिल हैं । कितनी बार हाउस में रक्षा सौदे की इस बात को स्पष्ट किया गया। कई बार पोजिशन को क्लीयर किया गया और अपोजिशन के पास कोई जवाब नहीं था । लेकिन. बार-बार इस बात को छेड़ देते हैं कि रक्षा सौदे में बेइमानी हुई । रक्षा सौदे के बारे में इल्जाम लगाने वाले व्यक्ति डिफेंस मिनिस्टर रह चुके, फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर रह चुके । उस वक्त भी और बाद में भी उन्होंने यही कहा था कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कभी आज तक मेरे काम में दखल नहीं दिया । यह रिकार्ड पर हैं । यह कोई फर्जी बात नहीं है । बाद में जाकर इल्जाम लगाया। सुबह कुछ कहा और शाम को कुछ कहा । यह मुनासिब बात नहीं । रक्षा सौदे का हम क्या जिक्र करेंगे बार-बार । आप जानते हैं कि बाहर की कम्पनियां समान बेचती है सारी दुनियां में। प्राइवेट कम्पनी सामान बनाती हैं और बेचती हैं । उन कम्पनियों के एजेंट हर मुल्क मे मिलेंगे जिसने अपना सामान बेचना है वह उसके थ्रु बेचता है । वह प्राइवेट कम्पनी किसी प्राइवेट आदमी के नाम सारी कम्पनी कर दे तो इसमें भारत सरकार क्या करेगी । भारत सरकार तीन बातें देखती है कोई सौदा करते वक्त चाहे रक्षा का सामान हो या दूसरा सामान हो । पहला, यह कि सामान की क्वालिटी ठीक है या नहीं । दूसरे, सामान टाइम पर सप्लाई होगा या नहीं । तीसरा, सामान की कीमत ठीक है या नही । कीमत की बड़ी बात नहीं है । आज सीमाओं पर खतरा है देश को और देश को फौजी सामान की जरूरत है। अगर किसी सामान की आज जरूरत और वह सामान आज 100 रुपये की कीमत की जगह पर 110 रुपये में मिलता है तो वह सामान हम को 110 रुपये मे ही लेना पड़ेगा देश की रक्षा के लिए। सवाल देखने का यह है कि सामान ठीक है या नहीं । इसको जनरल देखते हैं, इंजीनियर देखते हैं और बकायदा उसकी गारण्टी होती है । उसके बाद उसको परचेज किया जाता है । आज इस तरह की बात कहते हैं कि रक्षा सौदे में देश में जो सामान आया है, फौजों के पास जो

सामान है, जो तोपें हैं, बन्दूकें हैं, राइफल हैं, वे अच्छे नहीं हैं, नकली हैं, इससे ज्यादा देशद्रोह की बात दुनियां में क्या कोई हो सकती है ? जो व्यक्ति देश की फौजों का मनोबल कम करता है उससे बुरी बात और क्या हो सकती है । सीमा पर जवान राइफल लेकर खडा है और हम कहें कि यह राइफल नकली है तो उससे फौज का मनोबल कम नहीं होगा तो क्या होगा । जो देश की फौज का मनोबल कम करता है उससे ज्यादा गद्दार इस मुल्क में कोई नहीं हो सकता है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री एच० हनुमनतप्पा) : किसी के लिए इस शब्द का इस्तेमाल न करें क्योंकि यह अनपार्लियामेंटरी है ।

श्री भजन लाल : जो देश की फौज का मनोबल कम करें उसके लिए मैं कह रहा हूं ।

सरदार जगजीत सिंह अरोड़ा : इस गन को किसी ने भी खराब नहीं कहा है ।

श्री भजन लाल : जो सामान आया है उसकी बात कह रहा हूं ।

सरदार जगजीत सिंह अरोड़ा : तोप की बात हो रही है ।

श्री भजन लाल : आपने तोप की बात कह दी । आप तो बड़े जनरल रहे हैं । आपकी देशभक्ति में कोई संदेह नहीं है । जिस जनरल ने एक लाख फौजी लोगों को बंदी बनाया उसकी हम तारीफ करते हैं और हमेशा आपकी मिसाल देते हैं । आप खुद मौके पर गये थे, आपने कहा कि तोपें अच्छी है । आपने इसको सर्टिफाई किया ।

सरदार जगजीत सिंह अरोड़ा : हमेशा यही कहा गया है कि इसकी बैकलोक तो खराब हो, लेकिन किकबैक जो है उसने तंग किया है ।

श्री भजन लाल : यह तो टेक्नीकल बात है, हम नहीं जानते है । लेकिन फौज के पास जो तोपे हैं उनके बारे में कुछ कहा जाये जिससे फौज का मनोबल कम हो तो उसके लिए क्या कहा जा सकता है मैं उस शब्द को रिपीट नहीं करना चाहता हूं । लेकिन हमारे अपोजीशन के भाई जो ठीक बात है उसको भी ठीक नहीं कहते हैं । भारत इतना खूबसूरत देश है । महात्मा गांधी के आदर्शों पर चल कर देश आगे बढ़ रहा है । हमारे देश में कितने ही धर्मों के लोग बसते है, कितनी ही भाषाओं के बोलने वाले लोग रहते हैं और इस देश में अनेकता में कितनी एकता है, यह किसी से छिपा हुआ नहीं है । हमारा देश मजबूत और महान कैसे बने, इस पर हमें सोचना चाहिए और मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश की नीतियों और प्रोग्राम की वजह से हमारा देश आज तरक्की के रास्ते पर आगे बढ़ रहा है । जो लोग देशवासियों को गुमराह करने की कोशिश करते हैं, देश को कमजोर करने की कोशिश करते हैं, वे ठीक नहीं करते हैं । पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने इस देश को कितना शानदार बनाया । इंदिरा गांधी जी ने देश के लिए अपने खून की बलि दी, अपनी जान भी न्योछावर कर दी । देश की एकता के लिए अपना जीवन दे दिया । श्री राजीव गांधी की वहां चर्चा की गई है । श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा जी ने चर्चा की कि दिल्ली में पांच हजार आदमी मारे गये और मिश्रा कमेटी की रिपोर्ट भी आई । मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जब श्री राजीव गांधी की मां की लाश पड़ी हुई थी तीन मूर्ति भवन में तो श्री राजीव गांधी दिल्ली के चौराहों पर घूम रहे थे, दिल्ली की गलियों में घूम रहे थे ताकि शांति कायम रहे । इससे ज्यादा बडी बात और क्या हो सकती हैं कुछ लोगों के भड़काने की वजह से कुछ खराबी हुई । इसमें कोई दो रायें नहीं हैं कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए । कुछ लोग हिन्दू और सिखों को लड़ाने की बात करते हैं, यह अच्छी बात नहीं है । हिन्दू और सिख में कोई फर्क नहीं है । एक ही मां के दो बेटे हैं । एक ने केश रख दिये तो वह केशधारी सिख हो गया और दूसरा हिन्दू रह गया । खून में कोई

[श्री भजन लाल)

फर्क नहीं है । गुरु तेगबहादुर जी ने हिन्दुओं की रक्षा के लिए धर्म की रक्षा के लिए अपना सिर दे दिया, अपना शीश दे दिया । गुरु गोविन्द सिंह जी के साहबजादों को दीवार पर चिनवा दिया गया । ये बातें इतिहास में छिपी हुई नहीं हैं । लेकिन जो लोग देश को तोड़ना चाहते हैं और कहते हैं कि कोई उग्रवाद नहीं है, यह सब भारत सरकार करवा रही है, यह ठीक नहीं है। भिंडरवाला भारत सरकार की देन है । कितनी गलत बातें हैं । हमारे पास ऐसे प्रमाण हैं जिनके आधार पर हम यह साबित कर सकते हैं कि कौन उनको बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं, इसमें किसका हाथ है । हम इसको साबित करने के लिये तैयार हैं । आप चैलेंज करें हमको और हम साबित करते हैं कि किस तरह से ये मुल्क को कमजोर करने की साजिश कर रहे हैं । आप लोग बाहर के इशारे पर इस देश को कमजोर करने पर लगे हुए हैं । यह केवल उनकी अपनी शक्ति नहीं है । उनके पीछे किसी बाहरी शक्ति का हाथ है, कुछ विदेशी हाथ है और कुछ अंदरूनी हालात को बिगाड़कर इस मुल्क को कमजोर कर रहे हैं । आप जानते हैं कि जब जब देश के अंदर कुछ शक्तियां ऐसे लोगों के हाथों में खेली हैं तब तब हमेशा यह मुल्क कमजोर हुआ है और टूटा है । आज मुल्क को मजबूत करने की आवश्यकता है । इसलिये यह हम सब का कर्तव्य बन जाता है कि हम सोचें कि हम देश को कैसे मजबूत बना सकते हैं । यह देश ऐसे ही आजाद नहीं हुआ । इस देश की आजादी के लिये कितनी ही माताओं ने अपने पुत्र और कितनी ही बहनों ने अपने भाइयों को देश की बलिवेदी पर चढ़ा दिया । जो इस मुल्क को तोड़ने की कोशिश करते हैं उनका हम सब मिलकर मुकाबला करें । यह हमारा कर्तव्य बन जाता है । लेकिन क्या नीतियां हैं आप लोगों की? यहां पर अगर मैं नाम लूंगा तो फिर तकलीफ हो जायेगी । क्या एन० टी० रामाराव और देवीलाल जैसे लोग इस मुल्क को चलायेंगे ? क्या पालिसी है उनके पास ? क्या प्रोग्राम है ? उनके पास कोई नीति नहीं है । नाटक दिखाते हैं और भगुवे कपड़े पहनते हैं । एक दूसरा श्री देवी लाल जी हैं वे कहते हैं कि साहब मैंने सारे कर्जे किसानों के माफ कर दिये हैं । मैंने सारे बूढ़ों को पेंशन दे दी है, नौजवानों को नौकरी दे दी है । लेकिन वहां इतना भ्रष्टाचार है जिसका कोई अंत नहीं है । हरियाणा पड़ोस में है । आंध्र में दूर जाने में दिक्कत होगी लेकिन हरियाणा में जाकर देखिये कि क्या हालत है । किस तरह का वातावरण बना रखा है । कहते हैं कि मुस्लिम लीग को तमिलनाडु में इन्होंने साथ लिया । वर्मा जी ने इल्जाम लगाया आप जानते हैं कि बी०जे०पी० ने हमेशा ऐसे लोगों का साथ दिया, पहले अकालियों का साथ दिया जिसके कारण पंजाब में हालात खराब हुए और आज यही बी०जे०पी० के लोग हरियाणा में लोकदल का साथ दे रहे हैं । आप देखना यही हालात हरियाणा में भी हो जायेंगे । जिनके पास कोई पालिसी नहीं है सिवाय लोगों को लड़ाने के, जातिवाद का जहर फैलाने के वे देश का क्या भला कर सकते हैं ? जातिवाद और अलगाववाद फैलाने से क्या देश चलेगा ? क्या रीजनल पार्टियां इस देश में राज चलायेंगी । किसी भी पार्टी की कोई पालिसी होनी चाहिये, उसके कुछ प्रोग्राम होने चाहिये । कांग्रेस का एक सौ साल पुराना इतिहास है । इस मुल्क को किसने बनाया है? आप जानते हैं कि किस तरह का वातावरण पैदा करके देश को कमजोर करने की कोशिश की जा रही है । हम चाहते हैं कि मुल्क आगे बढ़े, मजबूत हो और ऐसा कांग्रेस की नीतियों के आधार पर हो सकता है । कांग्रेस के पास ऐसी पालिसी है, प्रोग्राम है जिससे वह देश को आगे ले जा सकती है । लेकिन विपक्षी पार्टियां, जैसे एक पार्टी कर्नाटक में है लेकिन और जगह नहीं, एक पंजाब में है लेकिन हरियाणा में नहीं । कोई आंध्र में है लेकिन बंगाल में नहीं । किसी की बंगाल में है तो उत्तर प्रदेश में नहीं । यह इन पार्टियों की हालत है । आज इस बात पर विचार करने की जरूरत है कि हमारा देश मजबूत कैसे बने । यह देश

मजबूत तभी बन सकता है जब हम डटकर उग्रवाद का मुकाबला करें । जो दोहरी नीति है कि चोर को कहो लग और शाह को कहो कि जाग । चोर को कहेंगे कि चोरी कर और शाह को कहेंगे कि जाग चोर आ रहा है । इस तरह की दोगली नीति से इस देश का काम चलने वाला नहीं है । जब तक हमारी एक नीति नहीं होगी, जब कि हमारा माइंड हमारा दिलोदिमाग साफ नहीं होगा तब तक देश मजबूत नहीं हो सकेगा । हम सब को मिलकर अपने दिमाग को साफ करना है तभी जाकर देश आगे बढ़ सकता है । कुछ लोग हैं जो केहर सिंह जैसे मुलिजम के बारे में कहते हैं कि उसको फांसी मत दो । ऐसे लोग देशभक्ति का भी दम भरते हैं । इन्दिरा गांधी, जिन्होंने देश की एकता और अखंडता के लिये अपनी जान दे दी उनके कातिलों के बारे में ये कहें कि उनको फांसी मत दो क्या यह उचित है । मैं श्री वाजपेयी जी और राम जेठमलानी जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट का फैसला हो गया, राष्ट्रपति जी ने उसकी अपील नामंजर कर दी और उसके बाद यह कहना कि उनको फांसी न दी जाय तो क्या उग्रवाद को बढ़ावा देना नहीं है इस से उग्रवाद ज्यादा बढ़ेगा या कम होगा ? अगर कोई आदमी गुनाह करता है तो हमारा यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि उसको सजा दिलाने की कोशिश करें ताकि आइंदा वह उस तरह के गुनाह को करने का साहस न करे । अगर गुनाहकारी को बख्शने की बात कहेंगे तो अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी और गुरुपदस्वामी जी भी सेफ नहीं हैं । अगर ऐसे लोग होंगे तो क्या उनकी जिंदगी सेफ रहेगी ? इसलिये जो आदमी गुनाह करता है तो उसको अवश्य ही सजा मिलनी चाहिये । कानून हर आदमी के लिये है चाहे वह छोटा हो चाहे बड़ा हो । लेकिन जब ऐसे लोगों के बारे में इस तरह की बात कहेंगे तो यह ठीक नहीं हैं । उग्रवादी निर्दोष लोगों को मारते हैं और कुछ लीडर उनके भोग में शामिल होते हैं । जो मुकाबले में उग्रवादी मारे जाते हैं यह उनके भोग में शामिल होते हैं तो क्या यह देशभक्ति की बात है ? बहुत सोचने की जरूरत है, बहुत विचार करने की जरूरत है । हम सब लोगों को इन लोगों को कंडम करना चाहिये तथा उनके भोग में शामिल होने के बजाय उनको चौराहों पर लटकाना चाहिये ताकि लोग देखें कि गुनाह करने वालों की क्या हालत होती है जिससे आइंदा दूसरे लोग कोई गुनाह न करें इस देश के अन्दर कुछ भाई हरमन्दिर साहब में कभी अकालियों को खुश करने के लिए बात कहते हैं कभी दूसरे लोगों को खुश करने के लिए बात करते हैं । जे० एंड के० में जो कुछ हो रहा है किसी ने उसको कंडम नहीं किया है । उसको कोई कंडम करने की बात नहीं करता लेकिन अपने स्वार्थ के लिए कुर्सी के लिए बात करते हैं कि किसी तरह से प्रधान मंत्री राजीव गांधी को कुर्सी से हटाना है किस तरह से यह कुर्सी उनको मिल सकती है । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि राजीव गांधी कोई मिट्टी का बना हुआ नहीं है उनको लोगों ने बैठाया है और फिर बैठायेंगे लोग जानते है कि इस देश को वही आगे ले जा सकते हैं अगर कोई पार्टी है तो वह कांग्रेस पार्टी है और उसके नेता राजीव गांधी हैं जो देश को आगे ले जा सकते हैं । इनके पास लीडर कौन हैं, क्या इनके प्रोग्राम हैं ? इनकी पार्टी का सुबह नाम कुछ होता हैं, शाम को कुछ और रख लेते हैं यह देश को चलाएंगे ? आज राजीव जी की बाहर की नीति देखिये । कितना झमेला था । चीन और पाकिस्तान के साथ किस तरह से वातावरण को शुद्ध करने की उन्होंने कोशिश की है ताकि दोनों मुल्कों में तालमेल ठीक हो दोनों पड़ोसी मुल्क हैं और कितना हमें आर्मी पर खर्च करना पड़ता है । उन्होंने वातावरण को शुद्ध करने की कोशिश की है ताकि दूसरे मुल्कों के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे हों, वातावरण ठीक हो और आपस में हम अमन से रहें । यह कोई छोटी सी बात नहीं है । 35 साल के इतिहास में चीन और पाकिस्तान के साथ पहल कर के राजीव गांधी ने

[श्री भजनलाल]

बहुत बड़ी बात की है। अब हम सब का यह कर्त्तव्य बनता है कि इस देश को मजबूत बनाए। मैं ज्यादा समय न लेकर इतनी ही बात कहना चाहता हू इस सदन के माननीय सदस्यो से कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में बहुत अच्छी-अच्छी बातें कही है। आज आप जानते हैं कि बेरोजगारी का कितना ममला है। बजट में भी पांच सौ करोड़ रुपया बेरोजगारी को दूर करने क लिए और ज्यादा दिया गया हैं। हमारी कांग्रेस पार्टी का बाकायदा फैसला था कि हमने हर परिवार में से एक पढ़े-लिखे नोजवान को रोजगार देना है। उसके लिए पाच सौ करोड़ रुपया अलग से रखा गया है। राष्ट्रपति जी अपने अभिभाषण में इस बात को चर्चा की है यह कोई छोटी बात नहीं है। जब हर परिवार में एक आदमी को रोजगार मिलेगा तो उसकी हालत मे सुधार आएगा, उसके जीवन में नयी रोशनी आएगी उसका जीवन सुखी होगा बहुत बड़ी बात करने जा रहे हैं। और भी बहुत से प्रोग्राम और पालिसीज है मैं यदि एक-एक बात को कहूं तो समय बहुत लगेगा। मैं ज्यादा समय न लेता हुआ राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया गया है उसका मैं समथन करता हू। आपका मैं आभारी हूं। आप ने मुझे समय दिया। धन्यवाद।

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, since we celebrate this year the centenary of birth of Jawaharlal Nehru, our President has promptly started his Address by paying a great tribute to Nehruji, the architect of modern India who laid the foundation for democracy, secularism, socialism and non-alignment and built our nation with perspective and great values and visions. My disappointment with this Government is that the President's Address has totally failed to deal with the question of how we are implementing the policy of Panditji, how we are honouring the tenet of socialism advocated by Nehruji, how we are fighting against fundamentalism, superstition and ignorance and how we are honouring the assurance given by Panditji to non-Hindi speaking people on the language issue.

Celebrations are intended not to hold functions or festivals, but for adoption and adherence.

During the first four years of the Seventh Plan, the Government claims that economic growth scaled unprecedented levels of achievement. Despite the drought, the foodgrain production has increased to the level of 170 million tonnes. The industrial growth rate is nine per cent and economic growth rate is 3.6 per cent. It claims growth rates higher than those in 1980. Moreover, the Government is claiming that its frontal attack on poverty has made a dent on unemployment and implementation of anti-poverty programmes has made a great impact on the spheres of development and welfare. Sir, if these claims are true, genuine, sanguine, tangible and acceptable, I would be the first Member to garland and congratulate the Prime Minister for his record of achievements. But the facts and figures reveal a different story, quite opposite to the claims of the Government.

Sir, the President's Address has ignored to take stock of the entire situation prevailing in the country. It seems it has neglected to examine the fair criticism and comment against the party in power at the Centre. It has evidently attempted to cover up the inefficiency, corruption, malpractices, drawbacks, omissions and commissions of this Government. The address is like a silver-coated copper plate.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, no Minister is there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Two Ministers are sitting.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM: It is not a record of unprecedented achievements by this Government but of unheard of mis-

leading statements. It is not an Address to redress our grievances but an Address to suppress the facts and depress the truth.

Nehruji, on the eve of our Independence, that is, on 14th August 1947, while addressing the Constituent Assembly, to rouse the public and repose confidence in the millions and millions of people said:

> "The service of India means the service of millions who suffer. It means ending of poverty, ignorance, disease and inequality of opportunity. The ambition of the great men of our generation is to wipe every tear from every eye."

Sir, this was the pledge taken by our honourable late Prime Minister on 14th August, 1947. The words are still ringing in the ears of freedom fighters and old parliamentarians. I would like to ask this Government, have you taken any steps to stop the tears being shed from the eyes of the poor, to wipe every tear from every eye?

Sir, right from the First Five Year Plan the Government has been implementing so many anti-poverty programmes with varied names and the Government has claimed that it has achieved the targets. To the best of my study, the word "poverty" was first introduced in the Fifth Five-Year Plan and it has been stated that "Removal of poverty and attainment of economic self-reliance was enunciated as one of the objectives of the Plan." Now we are allotting huge amounts under various heads such as IRDP, NREP, RLEGP and TRYSEM. It is said that every third rupee spent on the Plan is for anti-poverty programmes. Considering all the measures in the various Ministries, it is estimated that more than Rs. 14,000 crores are spent for the welfare of the people. Every year the Ministry of Rural Development is submitting its report saying that we have achieved the targets or we have exceeded the targets in some cases in some States. Neither do I dispute the claim of the Government nor do I agree with the facts and figures furnished by the Government, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to the reality of the situation—the factual condition, opinion of the economists and some of the observations and recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. Sir, I am to remind that Dr. Murli Mohan Lal who studied about the anti-poverty programme has stated that at the present rate of development, India will harbour 50 per cent of the world's poverty-stricken and illiterate people by the turn of this century. This is the achievement, this is what we have achieved since the year 1947. To substantiate this view, a recent World Bank study also reveals that India is still at the bottom of the rung of development scale, occupying a position well within the lowest bracket of 15. If you go through the various reports and recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee, we could see how we have been misled by various Ministries, how the reality of the situation has not been brought to the notice of this supreme body, how the tall claims of this Government are unsupported by facts and unfounded by valid reasons. Sir, since we are said to have taken a pledge to remove the poverty to wipe out every tear from every eye, no wonder, every year huge amount has been allotted for the anti-povertpy programme. But what is the percentage rate of reduction per year due to the implementation of the anti-poverty programme? Sir, a few days back in the Lok Sabha the Minister concerned did not give the current figure. He only referred to the people who lived below the poverty line in the year 1983-84. He has no given the latest figure. Sir, in 1977-78 the number of people who lived below the poverty line 3,068 lakhs. In the year 1983-84 they were reduced to 2,915 lakhs. So, the reduction is 153 lakhs So, our progress is tardy, unsatisfacotry. That is why, the

[Shri Aladi Aruna *alias* Arunachalam.]

Public Undertakings Committee has passed adverse remarks about the implementation of these anti-poverty programmes. With the permission of the Chair, I would like to quote:

> "In the opinion of the Committee, the expenditure of Rs. 1,661.17 crores incurred by the Central and State Governments during the Sixth Plan had not yielded tangible results. In addition, the credit of Rs. 3,101.61 crores did not serve the purpose for which these were sanctioned."

Sir, this is the observation of the Public undertakings Committee. This observation has been substantiated or endorsed by a view of another economist which has been referred to by the same Public Undertakings Committee. Sir, I would like to quote:

> "In this connection, one of the economists has said that at the end of even years of the operation of the programme, only 3 per cent of the poor would have been helped to move above the poverty line and that too for a while only."

Sir, this view has been endorsed by the Public Undertakings Committee. So, at present, we have not been successful in our anti-poverty programme. At present, 272 million persons are living below the poverty line. We must be ashamed of this position.

Sir, if you examine the problem of unemployment, you would see that the wheel of progress is stuck in the mud of poor planning. The Government has been repeatedly giving assurances to the public that the unemployment problem would be solved at the end of the Seventh Five-Year Plan. This type of assurance was given during the Sixth Plan also. But Sir, instead of reducing the percentage of the unemployed people, the number of unemployed people during every Plan period is increasing. The number of job-seekers on the live register is increasing in every Plan period. In the Fourth Plan this number was 8.15 million. In the fifth Plan it increase to 13.41 million. In the 6th Plan it was 23.91 million and in the 7th Plan it is estimated to increase to 36.05 million. It seems our programmes become unproductive. So, it has been rightly pointed out in the report of the Public Accounts Committee dated 13-4-1987:

> "A number of schemes like crash scheme for rural development programme, food-for-work programme etc. had been launched in the past with a view to eradicate rural unemployment. It is to be regretted that these schemes have not been successful in making any significant dent on the unemployment situation in rural areas."

That is why our schemes have not been successful in implementation.

What is painful and intolerable is that even after 40 years of our independence, we are not able to give drinking water to the problem villages. We have failed in our targets during the Sixth Plan itself. There is a spill-over of nearly 39,000 problem villages to the Seventh Plan. Now, it has been indentified that one lakh thirty-three thousand villages have no drinking water facility. As usual, now it has been identified that one lakh thirty-three thousasnd villages have no drinking water facility. As usual, now it has been assured to the nation that the drinking water facilities will be given to all the rural population at the end of the Seventh Five-Year Plan. A study group of the Estimates Committee which went into the problem of drinking water facilities to the rural areas has estimated that the requirement of the amount is Rs. 7,700 crores, but the actual outlay in the Plan is Rs. 3,400 crores. That is half of the need. Secretary to the Rural Development Department also while he appeared before the Public Accounts Committee had stated that if we adopt this methodology we will be able to cover only 26

or 27 per cent of the population at the end of the Seventh Five-Year Plan.

The hon. Minister for Agriculture is always claiming pride for record foodgrains production saying that we have reached the level of 170 million tonnes. While claiming so he forgets one factor. There is no difference of opinion that there is a surplus in the market, but 300 million people are living before the poverty line. They have no money to purchase rice, wheat and other foodgrains. If they come forward to purchase there will be a shortage. We totally forget this factor.

Another important factor is that the minimum requirement of calorie per head is estimated at 2,400. The intake of calorie in developed countries is estimated at 3,470 and even in 13 last countries the average intake of calories is 2,339. But, unfortunately, in India, it is 2,189. The fact remains that in our independent life we have not given water, we have not given shelters and we have not even provided basic facilities.

We attained freedom at midnight. Still the darkness continues in the life. There is no dawn of life to the poor people.

In this Address the Government has dealt with many frivolous matters. At the same time, it has totally failed to deal with the outcome of the Chief Ministers Conference, which was recently held on the 9th and 10th of February. Sir, at the Chief Ministers' Conference it was reported that 11 important items which are closely related to the sources of revenue to the States have been discussed. Most of the Chief Ministers especially Dr. Kalaignar, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu had strongly urged the Centre to implement the consignment tax without delay. The 46th amendment of the Constitution enacted in the year 1982 which authorises the States to levy consignment tax on goods, still remains to be implemented by the Centre. Therefore, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has appealed to the Centre for early implementation of the consignment tax proposal. Most of the Chief Ministers have strongly opposed extending the levy of additional excise on further list of commodities such as vanaspati, drugs, cement, petroleum products, etc. Dr. Kalaignar has firmly opposed this proposal because the Centre did not keep its promise regarding precedence of additional excise duties in the case of sugar, tobacco and textiles. Therefore, the Government must drop the proposal of extending the levying of additional excise duty on vanaspati, drugs, etc. The Chief Minister of our State along with other non-Congress (I) Chief Ministers have asked the Centre to constitute Inter-State Council under article 263. This is not the first time this request was made by the Chief Ministers of various States but on many occasions they have requested the Government to consider this proposal but still we are not getting any response from the Centre.

I want to remind the House that the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Dr. Kalaignar has registered his protest on certain issues only for the object of protecting the interests of the State. At the same time, he has whole-heartedly extended his cooperation where it is required for the national purpose. He has reiterated his firm stand on unity and integrity of the country. At the same time, Dr. Kalaignar in his own way of intellectual expression has warned the Government by saying, I quote: "The situation we are faced with today in the Indian federation is not so much of the wheel tending to get loose from the axle but of the axle parting from the wheel."

This is a note of warning. If the axle is parted, then, the vehicle would be out of the road. So, I appeal to the Centre to correct itself as advised by our Chief Minister.

Sir, the verdict of the Tamil Nadu election is more important. But

[Shri Aladi Aruna *alias* V. Arunachalam]

unfortunately our President has not mentioned even a single word about it. It is a turning point in the history of our democracy. It has undoubtedly revealed certain facts to the nation. (1) This is the first time in our history an outstanding leader, Dr. Kalaignar who lost the poll in 1977 has come back to power with landslide victory due to his hard working, selfless service, sacrifice, determination and conviction. (2) Earlier the impression was that the politics of Tamil Nadu was always in the grip of cine actors and actresses. But now this has been wiped out from the mind of public. (3) The money power worth of Rs. 200 crores, misuse of mass media like T.V. and radio and abuse of administrative machinery which Congress party relied upon for the success of the elections have been ruthlessly nullified by the voters of Tamil Nadu. It has been demonstrated to the country that the Prime Minister, who visited the State more than 13 times and showed some gesture like Dr. M. G. R. during his election campaign, his leadership has been outright rejected by the people of Tamil Nadu Above all, when the voters of Tamil Nadu want a change or when they prefer another political party, they prefer the party with clear majority. That is why, this Government must have come forward to thank the people of Tamil Nadu for having elected Dr. Kalaignar to run the Government with stability with other people. The people of Tamil Nadu have established the political wisdom and sagacity. These things have not been mentioned in the Address. Therefore, Sir, I am unable to support this Address. With these words, I conclude.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, without any disrespect to the President, I must say that the Address this year has been disappointing, parochial and full of platitudes. It reads more like the Congress party manifesto than the Government's policies and plans for the coming year, 1989-90. I find in the Address that Pandit Nehru's name has been invoked but a secular, democratic and socialistic society is nowhere in sight. The number of people below the poverty line has increased during the last four years. Social justice is non-existent Terrorism, latent insurgency and secessionists are sustained by the unimaginative, anti-people and unjust policies of the Government. Paying lip-sympathy to Pandit Nehru's secular, humane and just policies is not enough. Practical actions are required. These unfortunately are non-existent In the last four years, the country has been more divided. There is more hatred, more violence, more mindless suppression, more alienation of minorities and weaker sections than ever before. The State terrorism has crossed the bounds of legality. Oppression of the innocent has crossed the limit in Punjab. Our worthy Minister, Shri Bhajan Lal ji has talked about the Opposition parties and certain other Members for having created antipathy and hatred. I would like to remind you, Sir, that in 1982 when the Asian Games were being held, the seed of this hatred was sown by the Haryana Government by humiliating every Sikh who wanted to come and see the Asian Games by searching them time and time again and treating them rather badly. Shri Bhajan Lal ji has also talked about Mr. Kehar Singh. People of all hues and kinds requested the President that Kehar Singh should not be hanged and be given life imprisonment. He appears to have been very upset about it. These views were expressed not only by the Sikhs but by the international human organisations. Legal luminaries in the country, most of whom are not Sikhs, are the ones who made this request. But while talking about this, I am surprised that he has not said anything about the punishment of the guilty of the November, 1984

5 P.M.

riots. Why? Because they belong to the Congress party. You cannot have discriminatory attitude even in law if you want to win people's confidence. All this time nothing has been done to bring the guilty to book. In fact, every effort has been made a shelter and save them from the law of the land.

Next, it is no use denying the fact that corruption has become endemic in our society. I find that the Government lacks the courage to take effective action against the erring and dishonest governmental and political functionaries. Mahatma Gandhi's code of behaviour about ends and means is often quoted but seldom practised.

Shri Bhajan Lalji has also said that the Congress party or the Government is being unnecessarily blamed for criminal squads. I am afraid, Balbir Singh, a police inspector who shot two senior police officers, was one of them who had been hired by the Government and his past police record shows that he was a criminal. Then, the administration themselves accepted the fact that they were using this squad justifying it by saying that the police forces all over the world use these tactics. Let us not be sanctimonious about these things. If you are doing something, you must have the moral courage to accept that you are doing that. What are these criminal squads doing? If they are merely killing a few terrorists, I have no querrel with them. But when these sqauds are looting banks, extorting money and indulging in smuggling activities without restraint, they are certainly not doing the nation any service.

In the Address, the Hindus and the Sikhs of the Punjab have been commended for their communal harmony and amity. I feel that it exists in spite of the Government policies and not because of their policies. Let us see what the good, sensible, patriotic and innocent people of the Punjab get in return for keeping communal harmony. You all have read about the Batala case where coercion, humaliation, false charges and police artocities have compelled the panches and the sarpanch to resign *en bloc*. The Governor went to find out what happened and persuade them. And what happened to those people who had the courage to tell the Governor what was happening? Some of them were beaten up again by the police. In this the way to deal with terrorism or is this a sure method of increasing terrorism? This mindless suppression will not improve the situation in the Punjab. It has been further aggravated purely by the Governmental policies. They must accept that they have failed. They must face facts. Nobody is being fooled by these policies. Possibly, the Government itself is. This sort of suppression, this cure, is worse than the disease.

Now, dealing with some other aspects, I think Government must practise what it preaches or what it lays down as law. Laws are passed to keep religion and politics separate. At the first opportunity religion is used to win elections as in Mizoram. Similarly, many laws have been passed to control wrong doings and un fair practices. Their application, however, is made discriminately. Misuse of Government machinery and media by the party in power has become routine and is indulged in shamelessly. It is claimed that the public distribution system has been strengthened and dynamised whereas the allotment quotas are being cut down and reduced in spite of the bumper crop of 1988-89. During 1987-88 it was claimed that inflation was kept below 10 per cent. Now in the President's Address we have been told that it had gone up to 10.5 per cent and in the Finance Minister's speech it has been accepted that it went up to 10.6 per cent. We are now being told that inflation has been reduced to 5 per cent this year. I only hope that the next year new figures don't come up. All the same as far as

[Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora]

an average family is concerned, the cost of household commodities etc. has increased manifold during this year. The public sector is still the sick man of India, our Indian industry and economy. Similarly, the increased burden has in the number of people employed in Governmental and public sector undertakings has not led to greater efficiency or greater empathy with the public; instead, it has led to greater corruption, sloth and road-blocks. No serious effort has been made to streamline the methods of decision-making and execution. Hardly any projects gets completed in time. Overcentralisation and concentration of power and all decision-making in one office has stunted the growth of leadership and killed the people's ability to take initiative. This does not serve the country well. In the last four years there has been some progress but it has been slow. There is too much sycophancy, not enough moral courage to stand up for one's convinctions. I am glad that in the last year of his Government the Prime Minister has started showing great enthusiasm towards panchayati raj. Why this sudden and belated awakening? Is it an election gimmick? Or, real, though belated, realisation that democracy can only take roots if it starts at the grassroots? It is a laudable concept and I hope it would be followed and pursued with sincerity and determination. Of course, the record of the last four years is not reassuring. I accept that this Government has not been shy in putting forth new ideas and reducing them in writing as policy measures, however half-baked they might have been. In the implementation sphere however, it has been singularly inept. Now I would like to give a word of warning here about panchayati raj. The devolution of power to panchavats must include financial resources and that must be in the hands of the people, elected people, and not the bureacrats. Similarly, the Centre must shed part of its stranglehold of power and the purse strings to the States. Otherwise, the Panchayati Raj will end up in chaos...(*Time Bell rings*)..Just one minute Sir.

I generally support the Governments initiative in the field of foreign affairs as far as China and Pakistan are concerned. We have to get along with our neighbours. It is better to talk to them rather than making faces. Of course, our vital interest of security and terrotorial integrity must not be compromised.

As far as Sri Lanka is concerned, the situation is still unclear and confused. Even after the elections in that country, violence continues unabated. The future of the Sri Lankan Tamils, for whose support we sent the Peace-Keeping Force, still remains unresolved. We would like our troops on peace-keeping duties in Sri Lanka to return home soon; the sooner, the better, but with honour and having completed their mission. They deserve our thanks and our gratitude. The Government has not spelt out its policy on this vital issue. This must be done.

Finally, the Government must face fairly and squarely the responsibility for the present situation in Punjab. It must also try and find a political answer to this problem which can only be done if democratic processes are started. Let us not forget that the country's strength lies in the people. For this we need a cohesive, well-knit and harmonious society where every one has equal rights and equal opportunities. For this we need an honest, efficient, just and non-discriminatory administration "My country, right or wrong" at tiutude is rather Jingoistic and is not patriotic. "My party, right or wrong" —this attitude can only lead to divisiveness, corruption and loss of moral authority. The record of the present Government in this respect has been singularly unedifying. I can-

not but express my great disappointment at the Address. There is nothing inspiring in it nor does it hold any hope for the future. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address to Parliament is an occasion to review the functioning of the Government in the past and to discuss its future programmes. But, listening to the honourable Members participating in the discussion from the other side, one gets the clear impression that they have vainly tried to diagnose many imaginary ailments, not realising that it has only betrayed their desperate attempt to create panic in the minds of the people.

Sir, four years back, when this Government took over, the country was not in an enviable position. On the contrary, there were many problems besetting us. The assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi had lacerated our body-politic. Violence was on the increase and underground activities in some of the sensitive border States were posing a severe challenge to the unity and integrity of the country. Unfriendly Governments of some countries in our neighbourhood had added a disconcerting dimension to our security environment.

During these four years, the situation has perceptibly improved. Major initiatives taken by the Prime Minister have convinced the people of Mizoram, Tripura, Assam and Darjeeling Hills about the futility of violence as a means to settle disputes and about the imperatives of strengthening the national mainstream by willing participation in the democratic processes.

Sir, the Punjab Accord had brought back peace to the strife-torn State. But the weak-kneed policies of the Barnala Government once again emboldened the anti-social elements. The result was escalation of violence. And the situation worsened with foreign and pouring in. Today the crime graph as such may not have come down, but there is a qualitative in the situation. There is no sympathizer or supporter of the Khalistan demand and the authority of the legally constituted Government is not usurped by a hand of criminals. All places of worship are once again under the effective management of the devout, and none fears to enter their portals to pay obeisance.

With the return of democracy in Pakistan, we can hopefully look forward to an improvement in our relations and an end to the supply of arms to those who have conspired to tear apart the beautiful fabric of India's unity in diversity. In that ambience the Government would be able to root out terrorism more successfully.

Sir, the world claims India's positive role in the comity of nations. On the initiative of Rajiv Gandhi a major break-through has been achieved in the elimination of nuclear weapons and in lessening of tension between the super powers. We are proud of the fact that the wise counsel of our Prime Minister is respected in the world. Unfortunately, some amongst the mostly of Opposition groups here are obvilious of our stature in the international arena. A new disperate outfit called the Janata Dal in its anxiety to oppose everything that the Congress stand for is working hard to devise a foreign policy which negates the one that is time-tested and is based on nationally accepted principles and values.

Sir, in this context it was somewhat surprising to bear Shri Jaswant Singhji talking derisively of our foreign policy, particularly with reference to the Prime Minister's visit to China. I think he has forgotten the rebuff suffered by the them Foreign Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji, when he visited China a few years

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

back. In sharp contrast to that, yau have that overwhelming reception being accorded to Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi when he visited China recently. And then he doubts the Prime Minister bartering away the interests of our country to the Chinese hands. Well, I suppose, nothing is more surprising than that, accusation.

Coming back to the domestic scene, a severe drought had heavily taxed our resources. But the Government demonstrated an adroit crisis management policy and capability, and the life remained normal. With sheer determination, the Government has made continuous progress in improving the quality of life of the ordinary citizen. The policies pursued by the Congress have started yielding results, with production going up and the number of people below the poverty line coming down perceptibly.

The Congress is committed to eradicate poverty and banish unemployment, the two objects which do not seem to have bothered the feudal instincts of a former Finance Minister and a self-proclaimed financial wizard who, in a recent interview as the President of the Janata Dal, has tried to hard to find fault with the Government's policies the other day. Sir, the limited resources notwithstanding, the National Literacy Mission has time-bound programmes to fight illiteracy and a National Housing Policy has been formulated that accords top priority to providing easy access to affordable shelter to members of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other weaker sections of society.

Sir, the country has made tremendous progress in the field of science and technology. But the opposition is either ignorant of it or, true to their style, do not want to acknowledge the benefits that accrue therefrom. The opposition leaders are refusing to accept that it is for the first time that we have crossed 9 per cent GDP and that there is promise of an appreciate rise in growth rate in the future.

Sir, I do not want to take the time of this hon. House in recounting achievements in all the areas that have flowed from the sound policies followed and a strong economic base a strong economic foundation laid by the Congress. But I do not want to emphasise that there has been consistent and sustained development over the last 40 years except during the short interregnum when the Janata Government was in power. Results have been more impressive during the last four years because the Government has not wavered in following the path laid by Pandit Nehru and Shrimati Indira Gandhi. This is what I wanted to tell Shri Aladi Aruna, but unfortunately he is not present in the House at the moment.

Sir, during the last one year, a number of vital legislative measures have been taken to deal effectively with the menace of drug trafficking, to improve the condition of service, etc. of the judiciary, to recognise and ensure the rights of labour, to fight crime against and accord equality to women, to protect and improve the environment and to fight corruption.

Law has been enacted to prevent the misuse of religious places. This was the first determined step to separate religion from politics and was followed by an amendment to the Representation of the People Act to provide for disqualification against persons convicted of a variety of offences. This initiative for electoral reforms demonstrate the commitment of the Government and Shri Rajiv Gandhi to cleanse public life knowing fully well that it could lead to many fores. ancti-social but strong, ganging up against the Government. Such possibilities have not deterred Shri Rajiv Gandhi from taking bold steps for the ultimate good of the country. It was again Shri Rajiv Gandhi who took the historic decision of reducing the vote

age to 18 years. He has abounding faith in the youth of the country and identifies himself fully with the yearnings and aspirations. This step of reducing the voting age is a manifestation of his desire to ensure that the youth of the country play a more significant, a more vital role in the national affairs.

The Prime Minister, believing firmly in a participatory democracy and an open Government, has initiated wide-ranging debates on many matters of policy. But unfortunately the reponse from the opposition did not come in equal measure. They, on the other hand, have striven hard to rake up issues. Having exposed themselves, having exposed their lack of ideology favourable to the national interest, they are now fishing for the slightest pretext to capture headlines in the Press. That explains the last two or three days' happenings in Parliament. Shri Jaswant Singh's eloquent endeavour to shift the burden on the Prime Minister for the demeanour of Shri Jaswant Singhji himself and of his colleagues in the Opposition does not carry conviction. What the Prime Minister observed about the cause of terrorists being subserved by one hon. Member of this House should have led to a candid self-introspection on the part of the Opposition leaders. But instead, Sir, what we witnessed was turmoil and the manifestation of a resolve to stall the functioning of the Parliament. It was unfortunate that they decided to boycott the proceedings of this House and the other House for two days and wanted to make a history of sorts by keeping themselves away even when the Budget was presented to the Parliament and to the nation.

Sir, we have never challenged the patriotism of the Opposition as such. We do not arrogate any such right to ourselves. But it is also a common experience that sometimes for narrow political ends and cheap publicity, we do cross the parameters and the clearly laid-down boundaries of rightful political activity. Any support to the demand of an autonomous Khalistan within the Union of India has grave portents of secession and balkanisation of the country. This, the extra-ordinary wise and learned hon. Member of the Janata Party should have realised before he expressed such views. Now, instead of making amends, he, as usual, resorts to blatant abuses. In a fit of anger he loses equanimity and presses on his infernal machine which spews nothing but invectives. And he is least concerned if such irresponsible outbursts expose to contempt and ridicule the democratic institutions of the country. Sir, I wish the gentleman, the hon. Member were present here. I fear he would not. In his endeavour to sound patriotic, he proclaims from a fragile moral platform of conceit that unlike the Prime Minister of India, he has to live and die in India. Sir, it is his good fortune that he happens to be an Indian by birth and can get away with such actions which could lead to concentration camps and mental asylums elsewhere. In any case, Sir, Parliament is no where not the place for people of rabidly perverted brains that hold decency in utter contempt.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajasthan): Sir, on a point of order, I want to say that against an hon. Member of the House it is not fair to use certain adjectives. He is free to criticise and say that he should not have done this, but to use words like perverted, concentration camps, and all that is not fair.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, I only said that elsewhere such action could lead to concentration camps.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA: I am not saying this on behalf of the Member, but this way the dignity of the House is questioned.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Incidentally, it is against such Indians that the country has to guard itself, I repeat that the country has to guard

[Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal]

itself. We can fight and defeat the enemy from without but it is the people of the country who have to fight, who have to guard the country against the enemies from within.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Bansal, let us avoid the abuses.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Sir, kindly see what I said. I simply say that we have to guard ourselves against enemies from within who are marauding in the guise of a saint and patriot concerned with India's integrity and independence.

Sir, the world wept when Shrimati Indira Gandhi gave her life at the alter of India's unity and integrity. On taking over as the Prime Minister of the country, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, wholly unmindful of the personal risks rushed to the riot-hit areas of Delhi to ensure that the madness must end. At a critical juncture in our history the nation reposed unprecedented confidence in him. To this unquestioned leader of the world's largest democracy, Shri Jethmalani, the avowed moralist of the Opposition chooses to say that he has tasted the political cake baked on the funeral fires of his mother. Sir, I feel ashamed to repeat these words and the gentleman there flaunts pride for his dexterity to use the language of the gutter with natural ease.

Sir, in October last year when the Hon. Member visited Chandigarh, where he made that controversial speech, the Bharat Mukti Morcha of which he happens to be the President issued a booklet titled the 'Sikh Case', and what do you have in that? Brazen attempts are made to whip up Sikh feelings. Sir, it is the Congress, it is our leader, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, who holds Sikhs dear to his heart and in return the Sikhs have given him unflinching faith, confidence and love. If was a scene to see when Shri Rajiv Gandhi visited Punjab a few months back people baseched him to go to their villages so that he could put his feet on the soil of their villages, and Shri Jethmalani, to whip up the feelings of such patriotic people has the audacity to say and I quote "Sikhs are being branded as secessionists, terrorists and anti-national". Further the booklet goes on to say "In fact through persistent persecution, killings, indefinite detention and torture of innocent Sikhs, Goebbelsian anti-Sikh propaganda through the controlled media, false and exaggerated statements since Operation Bluestar, public mind has been deeply poisoned. Sikhs are being humiliated and virtually treated as hostages." Further, Sir, we have a permanent solution offered by that kinky morcha and it says, "there being no alternative to the formation of, and I want to lay emphasis on it"—an autonomous state within India." Sir, from what I have just quoted, you do not draw an inference other than that the hon. Member was speaking the language of terrorists. What other inference can be drawn from the same? Sir, this leads me to only one conclusion that in his outrageous lies and wild accusations he has out—Goebeled himself. On an earlier occasion I described him as a compulsive critic and my friend, Mr. Kamal Morarka was on my throat. Our to cut my throat. I did not know him so well then. The improvement in my understanding has been so substantial that propriety demands that I offer no description at this juncture. I however muse at this gentleman's vain efforts to prove that his capacity to hurl abuses at the Prime Minister, perhaps, earn him a place as high as the Prime Minister himself. Whether this is innocence, chicanery or blackmail, the people of the country would judge for themselves. In the meanwhile, he continues to celebrate himself and sing himself.

Sir, here I am reminded of George Eliot's Adam Bede: "He was like the cock who thought the sun had risen to hear him crow."

Incidentally, another leader, the arrogant son of a former Raja of Amethi who still basks in the feudal glory of pre-independence days goes to Jullundur and supports a change in the Status of Punjab, different from other States. A Chief Minister who regales on being addressed as 'Pradhan Mantri' and has a deep interest in the Punjab issue being kept alive, says that the killings in Haryana were not the result of terrorist violence. What do we infer from this? The hon. Members have the cheek to say here that it is the Congress-I which is keeping the Punjab problem alive. The only question that one should put to them is, if the lingering Punjab situation were to be solved today, who stands to gain from that? It is the Congress, and if the situation were to be kept alive, who gains from that? It is the different factions of Akali Dal, it is the Lok Dal, it is the BJP, it is the conglomeration of the opposition now called Janata Dal.

Sir, this practice of double standards by some self-proclaiming moralists has already done a great damage to the national cause. Misleading the people is surely no service to them. It is high time that we narrow down the gap between our words and deeds. Political dissent, political differences, in fact strengthen a democracy, provided these stem from ideology and are based on principles. Democracy, as we know, is a double-edged weapon: if wielded by desperate hands uncontrolled by a healthy nervous system, the result would be self-destruction. Sir, we have to guard against that, and it is gratifying that the mature people of India, the proud inheritors of an ancient heritage, have abundant capacity to do that notwithstanding all misleading gimmicks by the leaders of the opposition.

With these words, I associate myself with Shri P. N. Sukul in this motion of Thanks to the President. Thank you.

SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY (Assam): Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, with due respect to the President, I must say that his speech is more political document that anything else. In short, it is a fine whitewash on the dismal failure of the Government in the vital spheres of the country.

The welfare of the country has been relegated to the background. What we have seen is, the democratic norms, moral aspects of political life and the ethos of the secular republic have been at a discount for a long time. What has been uppermost in the consideration of the Government is seizure of political power by fair or foul means. We have seen how in Nagaland the party in power made a naked display of money power. The election in Nagaland and Mizoram is a mockery than actual election. In Mizoram, the personnel of the Central Government resorted to immoral and dirty practices to help the party in power to control the Government there. And what do we see in Punjab? The Condition of Punjab is deteriorating day by day. There is no mention in the speech of the hon. President when Punjab will get a popular government. In Assam brothers have been incited and financed against brothers for political gain by the vested interests. It has been done to destabilise the non-Congress (I) Government. I do not like to point my finger to any person but I feel that it has been the policy of the party in power at the Centre to destabilise non-Congress(I) Governments wherever they are in the country. Sir the federal structure of our Republic will collapse if the Centre happens to be basically corrupt, ethically debased and politically motivated in administration. In a country where the factors of political loss and gain guide administration, its consequences are bound to be disastrous. This is what is happening and what we are seeing everywhere in the country. Right from our international relations down to the minor issues at home, our approach to them has never been pragmatic. Our foreign policy needs ob-

[Shrimati Bijoya Chakravarty]

jective reappraisal and reassessment. Nothing stands constant in global relations. Emotions and sentiments have nothing to do with the global relations. Unfortunately, our approach to relations with certain countries have not been in conformity with our basic objectives. I would not like to name the countries but our diplomatic relations with certain countries have been guided by narrow and short-sighted policies, this is what I can say. Government should set up diplomatic relations taking into consideration our national interest. Our non-alignment and neutral foreign policy will have no meaning in the absence of positive approach in it.

Coming to the domestic issues involving the welfare of common masses, the Central Government is simply building super-structures. We talk of computers and high technology but we are oblivious of the fact that the rural masses today are living in an abject poverty. More than 70 per cent population of the country is yet to get minimum requirements for survival, not to speak of getting proper attention.

As far as the backward States are concerned, the Central Government's stand has been negative, half-hearted and highly partisan. I would like to cite an example. There has been utter negligence on the part of the Centre so far as Assam is concerned. It is best known to you that industrial development in Assam is very negligible. The per capita Plan outlay for Assam in the Seventh Five Year Plan is only Rs. 1055 crores which is less than half of the allocation for Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir. Assam falls in the special category States but this disparity of Plan outlay in respect of Assam is really unfortunate.

Sir, oil has been a sensitive issue for Assam Assam is feeding the Centre with oil but the Centre is not doing justice in respect of oil royalty. Since 1984 the royalty for oil has been given at Rs. 192 per tonne. Assam modestly demands Rs. 390 unlike Rs. 680 demanded by Gujarat but that also is being denied. Central Government has been earning huge amounts from oil fields of Assam but the hen that lays eggs has been deprived of its basic needs for survival.

Sir, Assam has been insisting on the amendment of the Income-tax Act, 1961, so as to enable the State to get maximum benefit but that is not being done.

Although tea is an agricultural crop only 60 per cent of its income is treated as the income from agriculture and the balance 40 per cent is taxed by the Central Government. Tea-growing States demand that entire income from tea should be treated as income from agricultural production. This would help the tea-growing States to benefit a little, but this is not being done. But that has not been done and the pattern of Central assistance to Assam as very partisan. During the year 1987-88, Assam was required to pay Rs. 188 crores as interest. Thus the benefit from the Plan assistance was offset by loan repayment. Moreover the poor State consistently requested the Central Government to declare a moratorium on repayment of Central loan for a period of five years so as to place Assam at par with the rest of the States.

What is more unfortunate, which I have repeatedly said in the House, is that the Central Government has yet to realise the dimension and gravity of the flood situation in Assam. Last year's floods broke all the past records in the country. The State is faced with a severe economic crisis due to floods. The Government of India finances flood control measures on the basis of hundred per cent loan. There is no justification for the stand of the Central Government Why should the Centre not treat floods in Assam as a national problem? Huge sums of

money are needed to control Brahmputra in Assam. By giving it as loan, the State can get nothing. At a time when the Central Government is spending crores of rupees in tamashas, festivals and cultural extravaganza at home and abroad, how can it be so miserly and close-fisted for a State like Assam and other States? These factors might adversely affect the Centre-State relations in the country. The recent appointment of Governors and the use of T.V. to project a particular person are pointers in this direction. This will surely erode the faith of people in democratic norms in the country. I fail to notice any sense of concern in the speech of hon'ble President towards the country and towards the welfare of the people.

With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion of Thanks moved by Shri Sukul because the Presidential Address is quite disappointing and to the extent it is given, it is not relating to facts. In this last year of Congress(I) Government in power, perhaps the Government wanted to cash in on the post-Independence years' achievements. Otherwise it would not have been such a resume or review of the past 40 years. They wanted to bring in the name of Jawaharlal Nehru of course reminding us of the Centenary, and also take advantage of that in order to see that the present regime is perpetuated. But it is very unfortunate that even while narrating the history, they have missed that there was a time when others also were Prime Ministers of this country. Only Nehru, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Ganhi—these three names—are mentioned, from grandfather to grandson. That means, almost a cult of family is sought to be promoted here rather than giving historical facts. Lal Bahadur Shastri was there as Prime Minister, Morarji Desai was there as Prime Minister and, whether we like it or not, certain events and certain things had taken place.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Some of the Members mentioned both the Prime Ministers.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: But in the President's Address it is not there. On the other hand, if the country is progressing, I could appreciate it but, unfortunately, that is not so. Through in my student days I was one of those who admired Nehru's sacrifice and service to the country, I did not like his regime. It was bad by itself, according to me, though the fact remains that he stood by certain very good ideals. The point is, they did not come into practice at all. That is why it was bad, Shrimati Indira Gandhi's regime was worse and now, the present Rajiv Gandhi Government, according to me, is the worst of all. Otherwise, what was expected of him in four years? That the prices would come down now that a new Prime Minister has come; he was a youngster and he was not going to follow the same things that were already there and he was going to evolve new policies and so on. But, what new policies are there? The country is running on the same old lines and, perhaps, in a quickened phase things are getting worsened. To cite one or two examples, I can bring to your notice what has happened.

So many times in the Presidential Address, the Constitution is mentioned and respect for the Constitution shown and so on. But did the executive stand by it? Or, did the Congress (I), which has been ruling at the Centre, stand by it? If we just see what happened on 27th February in West Bengal, we can understand it. According to our party, Governors need not be there; we do not want Governors. But, in spite of that, according to the Constitution they are there Even though we do not like the appointment of certain Governors and even if they are behaving very badly in some States

[Shri Moturu Hanumantha Rao]

like Kerala and Andhra Pradesh, we did not disrespect them, we did not physically handle them. We simply protested in the legally possible way. But, what has happened in West Bengal? In West Bengal they were physically dealing with the Governor. The Central Government has transferred him, and it was not at all warranted. Perhaps, they did not like the Governor to sail along with the State Government or to keep the cooperative mood there. That is why they wanted to change him, and they changed him. And what has their party done there? I need not say it in my own words. With your permission, I am quoting a few sentences that were written in "THE HINDUSTAN TIMES" in its editorial of 1st March. Here I quote:

> "The Congress (I) Legislature Party acted disgracefully when they not only obstructed him....."

"Him" means the Governor.

> "....from delivering the Address but went to the extent of manhandling....."

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV): Will the Assembly matters be discussed here? This is not proper.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: It is proper. So many times newspapers have been quoted. Individuals who are not here, though they are Members, are criticised, condemned, and they are quoted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You need not answer that.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: So, with the permission of the Chair, I am just repeating it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Not necessary Why do you repeat it?

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: I quote:

> "Congress (I) leaders acted disgracefully when they not only obstructed the Governor from delivering the Address but went to the extent of manhandling him. It was at this stage that the Left Front Members retaliated."

Then, Sir:

> "Congress (I) did not cover itself with glory by the actions of the MLAs. For some time, particularly after Mr. A. B. A. Ghani Khan Chowdhury assumed the leadership of the party in the State, Congressmen have been conducting themselves in a highly objectionable manner. When the party chief appeals to them to use stenguns against the Marxists, where is the place for decorum and decency in politics? Congress (I) is only digging its grave in the State by indulging in highly questionable tactics which make a mockery of democracy. It is high time that the high command restrained the party enthusiasts in West Bengal."

This is the editorial that was written by "THE HINDUSTAN TIMES" daily. So, Sir, we can understand how democracy is protected.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: "The HINDUSTAN TIMES" is a supporter of Congress (I).

SHRI MOTORU HANUMANTHA RAO: Whether "THE HINDUSTAN TIMES" is a supporter of Congress (I) or not, I am only concerned with what has been written in this context. The point is, the President says that democracy, socialism secularism and non-alignment are being protected and that they are being carried out by the Government. Except non-alignment, broadly speaking, that too by and large in all other aspects, nothing is in practice. There is no democracy, there is no seculiarism, there is no

socialism at all. It is a misnomer. So, some of my colleagues here were commenting on the Prime Minister's visit to China and Pakistan and his negotiations with them. I fully agree with what has been done by the Government of India in regard to just restoring the friendship with our neighbouring countries like China and Pakistan. But the point here is in regard to other items this Government has not been practising them at all. So, one example, I have cited here, Sir.

Are they having any constitutional propriety? My hon. friend has been speaking of constitutional propriety and all those things. Here I am again quoting, Sir, with our permission, what has been written by the Editors Guild in regard to the murder in Vijayawada from where I come. Sir, a murder has taken place, a Congress MLA was murdered, and it was condemned by all. How it was motivated and who has done it, all these things we can discuss. But, if every murder is followed with such a holocaust which has taken place in Andhra Pradesh, I do not know what happens to this country. There are so many gangs who kill each other. So 6.00 p.m. many things are going on. A Congress (I) MLA was murdered in Gujarat; a Telugu Desam Party MLA was murdered in Andhra Pradesh itself. So, all these things take place.

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV: What about the killing of the Rajya Sabha MP, who has been killed in Darjeeling?

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: We condemn that. Particularly when he is a Member of our party, why should we not condemn it? We condemn it also. The point here is that the Editors' Guild in Vijayawada context refers to a Central Minister. Otherwise I would not have quoted it. It says:

"We note with a deep disquiet Union Minister Shiv Shanker's attempts to aggravate the situation. Some of his speeches, as also of some other Congress leaders' are included in the appendices. Shiv Shanker gave currency to remarks about whose varacity he was himself not sure and which were possibly inflammatory. He also gave the impression of Central rule being round the corner. This further demoralised the administrative apparatus and aggravated the situation. All this has a bearing on Centre-State relations, especially in a State ruled by non-Congress (I). One wonders whether the Centre is even now aware what harm Shiv Shanker has caused to Centre-State relations by his actions and statements. We are also disturbed to note that all though the army was initially prepared to help and some Jawans had even climbed into buses, they were unloaded because of alleged lack of instructions. This was unfortunate in the extreme. The Centre must have a clear policy on the issue so that the army can deal with an emergency situation irrespective of which party is in power in the State."

This has been mentioned by the Editors' Guild.

The point is that no norms and forms that are generally observed by the Constitutional traditions and other things are being observed by this ruling party This Executive his no respect for the State Governments that were elected by the people as the Government of India itself.

So, when such is the situation, how can the Constitution be respected? It is only in breach and violation of the Constitution that they have been acting like this. So, my point is, the President has spoken that democracy and secularism be saved. In regard to secularism we have already seen how in Mizoram Christian gods were prayed in the Manifesto. If it was an

individual, I would not have objected but in the Manifesto issued by the Congress Party Christian gods were prayed and Christianity was praised. What for were they prayed? They were prayed for getting votes. It is an election offence. I don't know if anybody is taking it seriously there and going to the court. It is an election offence. So, Sir, nothing is respected.

Where is socialism? Towards that end rural poverty alleviation and all such things have been spoken in the Address, but I do not find anything like this in reality. All exaggerated claims of achievements have been mentioned here. It is also said that the public sector is in a commanding position. Is it so? In this connection I will just read out one or two lines from one special supplement on industrial development which appeared in the *Hindustan Times*. I quote: "The situation today is that for all practical purposes, the 1956 industrial policy statement that chaired Indian industry with multifarious rules and regulations is being given a silent but sure burial." So public sector is given a burial. This was given in this newspaper which is owned by a big industrialist... (*Interruptions*)... Regarding debt trap, it was denied by our hon. Minister but Mr. Salve who is the Chairman of the Ninth Finance Commission has said in Madras that as on 31st March our debt has reached a figure of Rs. 2,10,000 crores. This was the statement of Mr. Salve. It is likely that our dsbt servicing would reach 38 per cent of our exports.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Mr. Hanumantha Rao, please conclude now. This is the second round and your party has already exhausted the time.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: I am concluding. So this is our economic development. Regarding rural development also I spoke and quoted last time. Our hon. Minister, Mr. Bhajan Lal is not here. Now back he is claiming so many things. But in a statement he has gone on record that 12-13 per cent only of the beneficiaries of IRDP and NREP have been able to cross the poverty line. Others could not cross the poverty line? Why it was so?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Since then it has improved.

SHRI MOTURU HANUMANTHA RAO: Mr. Bhajan Lal made this statement in October, 1988. How all of a sudden it has gone up? I know that by magic also things are going up.

Now the inflation is said to be 10.5 per cent in December. The Economic Survey says that it is 8 per cent. The Presdential Address says it is 5 per cent only. May I know from the Government how it has come down from 10.5 per cent to 5 per cent within a few days. So with a galloping speed it is coming down and with the same galloping speed poverty is also going down. So these are not facts. They are simply imaginary things. That is why I say that the Presidential Address which is given to us does not contain facts. Only certain glorified and exaggerated things and achievements... are mentioned there and that is exactly why it should be opposed and I oppose this Motion of Thanks.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I stand to oppose the motion on President's Address because this Address is most disappointing to the people of this country. The President's Address could not even mention...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You are opposing the Motion or the Address?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Sir, the Motion itself. The Motion moved by the Treasury Benches. Sir, the Presdent's Address is most disappointing because it has failed to mention the important problem facing the country especially the people. The most important problems that are facing the country are the unemployment, poverty and the problems concerning the farmers, agricultural labourers and the problems concerning the toiling masses of this great country. Apart from this, the President's Address also failed even to mention the basic needs of the people. This Address could not give relief to the common people so far as essential commodities are concerned. The prices are rising up and nothing has been said about it. The people who have been suffering for a long time, expected that after independence, the country would be able to solve their problems and would be able to fulfil the promises made by their leaders. Under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and other important leaders of this country, we attained independence. We fought against th Britishers. We were of the opinion that our country will take a serious view of these things and poverty will be removed and at least the basic needs of the people of this country will be considered on priority basis. Even up to this day, there are thousands of villages where still we could not provide even clean portable drinking water. Leave apart other things, there is no proper shelter, no clothing and no food. This is the condition. You might have read recently in the press that in Bolangir District of Orissa, people are starving. There is no employment. there is no food and even up to this day, the Governments, neither the Central Government nor the State Government, could go there to help those unfortunate people. They are dying; they are not getting food. This is the situation. I have given an example of Bolangir district but such is the condition in most parts of the country. Aparat from this the President's Address has tried to glorify the achievements made by this Government at the Centre within these four years. The people of this country will decide whether these achievements really satisfy them or not. Before I go into some of the important points in detail, I would like to draw the attention of this House and also of the Government to the fact that the President has mentioned in para 4 of the Address, "as we enter the final year of this Parliament, we can look back with satisfaction to four years of constructive endeavours." In fact, Parliament consists of both Houses of Parliament and the President. I do not know what he means by it. (Interruptions). Most of us could not understand what actually the President or those who have drafted this President's Address mean by it. Anyhow, the Presidential Address has tried to glorify the achievements of this Government in these four years and has utterly failed to mention the real problems of the people. I would like to mention some of the more important points as I may not be able to deal with all the points, which I have noted down, within the time allotted.

The most important point is about the relations between the Union and the States. This is the most important point because until and unless you have smooth relations between the States and the Union it is not possible for the Union Government or the State Governments to carry on with their policies and programmes to meet the requirements of the people in a better way. Does the Central Government really want the country to be strong? If it is so, the Union Government, at every stage, should not interfere with the affairs of the States. The Union Government should not usurp the powers of the States. Only if the States remain strong, the Union will remain strong. After all, what is the Union?

[Shri B. Satyanaranyan Reddy]

India is nothing but a Union of States. If the States become weak, if their powers are taken away, the Union also becomes weak. We want our country to remain strong and prosperous. It should be strong and prosperous in every wing of it. Just as every limb of our body should be strong for us to remain healthy, every part of the country should be strong and prosperous. The States should not be weakened whether they are Congress-ruled or non-Congress-ruled. But in practice, it has been noticed that there is a step-motherly treatment so far as non-Congress-I Governments are concerned. Undemocratic methods have been adopted, both in the past and even now, to dislodge the duly and democratically elected Governments in the States. I need not go into the details of it. But I will give one example. When the Telugu Desam party was elected to power under the leadership of Shri N. T. Rama Rao, the Central Government, the Union Government, from the day of its election, tried to dislodge his Government. They tried in 1984. They tried so many times after that. Still they are trying to dislodge the Government there. But they could not succeed and they will not succeed. Similarly whether it is West Bengal or Karnataka or any other State where a non-Congress Government is in existence, they are trying to dislodge. It is not proper. The Centre, the party in power at the Centre should desist from adopting such methods. If they adopt such methods, it means they are only thinking of the interests of their own party and not of the country as a whole. Please think for the country as a whole. We want them to think of the different parts of the country. You say that in some States regional parties are in power. Yes, they are regional, but they are regional with national outlook. They are more national...(Interruptions)... than your so-called national party which is in power at the Centre because you are trying to weaken every part of the country. You are not having the interests of the States in mind but only the interests of your party so that your party may remain in power whether it is at the Centre or in the Staes, at the cost of the people of the country, at the cost of the unity of the country, at cost of attitude should be given up. Unless and until you give up this attitude, it is not proper for you to continue in office. Though the Sarkaria Commission was appointed, the Central Government's attitude towards recommendations of the Sarkarii Commission is really regrettable. The suggestion given by the Sarkaia Commission have been ignored by the Central Government. The Sarkaria Commission wants a better relationship between the Centre and the States. The suggestions given by the Sarkaria Commission have not been taken into consideration by the Central Government. The Central Government has failed to take the States into confidence before taking decisions of national significance, particularly in the financial sector. Whether it is the Sarkaria Commission or any other commission, everyone wants that there should be better relations between the Centre and the States. If the Centre is trying to snatch away the powers of the States, that will not be good for the country.

Another thing I would like to bring to the notice of the House is that the Centre has a definite responsibility to cooperate with the State Governments, as has been suggested by Justice Sarkaria. But the Centre has been seeking to trample upon the norms of parliamentary democracy by giving more financial powers to the District Magistrates by passing the elected Governments. This is very unfair and it amounts to gross interference with the State subjects, though it appears to give more powers to panchayats. But it is a sphere of the State, something which the State has to do. Unfortunately the

Centre is trying to somehow or other enter into or interfere with the State sphere and it wants to disturb the whole fabric. I must tell the Central Government, this is not fair on your part and this will only weaken the country; this will not strengthen the country. Therefore, the Centre should immediately give up its efforts to grab more and more powers to itself ignoring the interests of the States. (time-bell rings) Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have only just started; this is only an introduction...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): As a panel Vice-Chairman you know your party has got only twelve minutes. That is why I have just reminded you that your time is up.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: That is why I wanted to speak only tomorrow...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): But that will not change the position. Please cooperate with the Chair.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I, therefore, demand that more financial powers should be given to the States and the Centre must give up its efforts to weaken the States.

Now, so far as the role of Governors is concerned, the Governors should act according to the provisions of the Constitution, whether it is the Congress-ruled States or non-Congress ruled States. There is trouble with the post of Governor. In some of the non-Congress ruled States it has been observed, there have been serious complaints, there has been agitation, it has been reported in the press, that the Governors are not cooperating with the non-Congress ruled State Governments, that they are not functioning properly, that they are not acting as per the provisions of the Constitution and that they are acting as the functionaries of the Congress Party; some have called them agents of the Centre or the Union. They should not act like that, whoever may be the Governor, whichever may be the State, whichever may be the party ruling in the State. Complaints have come from especially Andhra Pradesh and Kerala. Governors have been appointed without the consent of the Chief Ministers concerned, whether for Andhra Pradesh, Kerala or any other State in the country. The Sarkaria Commission has recommended that before the appointment of a Governor the Centre should at least consult the Chief Minister concerned saying that they are appointing so-and-so as the Governor of that State. The Governor should not be a party man. What happened in Andhra Pradesh? What happened in Kerala? Only Congress (I) members have been appointed. It should not be done. If you really want that the Governors should act impartially and act according to the provisions of the Constitution, you must appoint those people who can really work for the betterment of the country as a whole.

Then, the President's Address has said something about our economic growth and economic achievements. But really I fail to find any substance or force in this, so far as the economic growth is concerned, though we attained independence forty years back, when we compare ourselves with those countries which got freedom later, it is not much. Take, for instance, China. I had been to China and I had been thereon a tour for about fifteen days and I found that they were more advanced than us. Even some of the small countries are going ahead of us. So we should not boast that our economic growth is like a miracle and all that. That is not so. I feel that the real situation that is prevailing in the country should be

[Shri B. Satyanaranyan Reddy]

revealed in the Address. But that has not been done.

Something has been said about electoral reforms also. This is a very important thing. So far as this question is concerned, it is agitating the minds of all and a discussion is going on electoral reforms for the last twenty years. Many points have been raised by distinguished personalities, whether intellectuals or Press people or political leaders, and the Government tried to bring forward a Bill. But they could not bring forward a comprehensive legislation so far as electoral reforms are concerned It is therefore necessary, that the required changes in the Constitution should be made.

We have been greatly concerned about the role of money power in elections. In the recent Bill that has been passed, nothing much has been done so far as this aspect is concerned. That did not satisfy anybody. We have been pleading all these days that there should be State funding of elections. But that has not been touched upon and nothing has been said about it. I would like to inform this House and the country that last year, the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister Mr. N. T. Rama Rao had called a meeting in New Delhi to discuss the question of electoral reforms, especially the question of State funding of elections. This meeting lasted for about two days, that is, on the 24th and 25th October. On the first day, many intellectuals and experts had attended the meeting and, on the second day, representatives of various political parties had come and they discussed this issue and they came to the conclusion that in order to curb the money power in elections it was necessary that State should fund the elections and that should be accepted and only then this problem could be solved. This problem has been agitating the minds of various political parties in this country for long. So, unless and until we enact and adopt a legislation to have State funding of elections, I do not think that his problem of money power in elections can be solved. Then, Sir, in the Presidential Address something has been said about the exports and imports. We see that imports are more than exports. We could not have more foreign reserves because our imports are more than exports. How are you going to meet this problem? This has not been clearly mentioned. (Time Bell rings).

Very often we have stated in this House that there is no proper parity between the agricultural produce and the industrial produce. The farmer should have a remunerative price for his produce. Nothing has been said so far as this is concerned. No serious thought is being given so far as the problems of this important section of our society is concerned.

The right to work is a fundamental right in the Constitution. This issue has been agitated by the working class and the toiling masses of this country.

Then, Sir, the allotment of food supplies to the States is not sufficient and this should be through a proper public distribution system.

So far as the demand for just wages by the agricultural labourers is concerned, this has been ignored. No proper attention has been given to this.

Lastly, Sir, the Presidential address mentioned something about peace on our border. We all want that peace should prevail in this country, whether it is peace on the border or peace throughout the country. We want peaceful atmosphere, a peaceful condition, throughout the country. Both are essential for our country's progress and strength. But the policy and attitude of the government are not conducive to have these peaceful conditions. we want that the Government should change its polcies so far as the border problem is concerned.

What happened in Punjab? The democratically elected Government of Mr. Barnala has been dismissed and President's rule imposed. We thought that things would improve. But the violence and terrorism is more. There are more killings after the promulgation of President's rule than what it was during Mr. Barnala's rule. So things have not improved.

We have talked about border fencing and all those things, whether it is with Bangladesh or Pakistan. Every day infiltrators are coming into the country. They are disturbing, and peace has not prevailed. So the Government has utterly failed to take effective measures, to have peaceful condition on the borders. So the Government must change its policy so far as this is concerned. (Time bell rings.).

I would like to know how many terrorists have been tried in the courts of law. Why have they not been tried? We hear daily from the Press that so many people have been killed or arrested. We have not heard so far as to how many terrorists have been tried in courts of law or what has happened to them. After arresting, are you detaining them or are they escaping? Is there any production in factories where terrorists are being manufactured? From where are they coming? I do not understand it. They are being captured. They are being arrested. Where are they being kept? What is the Government doing with them? Where are they being tried? No convincing details are there. We would like to know what the Government wants to do with this problem of terrorism.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Please conclude.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I am concluding please.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You have taken three times of your time.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: There are so many points. But I would like to concentrate on one or two points.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): You have said 'one or two points' half a dozen times.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: So far as our relations with our neighbouring countries are concerned, I would like to say that we want that India should have friendly relations with all our neighbours, whether it is Pakistan or China or Afghanistan or Ceylon or Burma or Nepal or any other country. Before our Prime Minister's visit to China, I told him once that we were not opposed to his visit to any country, whether it is China or Pakistan or any other country, but he must have one thing in mind. He should not forget the resolution adopted by the Parliament in 1962. He should bear in mind that resolution. He said: "Yes, we will bear that in mind." So, I would like to know what actual results have been achieved. Vast areas of our country, especially more than half of Aksai Chin, is under the illegal possession of China. Similarly, some other parts are there. I do not exactly know the total area that is under the illegal possession of China. This is a very sensitive issue. We want that in order to have friendly relations, this issue should be resolved to the satisfaction of the people of this country. What we have been given to understand is "mutual understanding of both the countries, etc. etc." I do not understand the meaning of these words. What do they mean? Do we have to give up some of our areas or do they have to give up some of their area. So far as we understand, India is not in possession of any Chinese territory. I do not understand the meaning of these words. We want to be friendly with the Chinese Government. But India is not in illegal possession of Chinese territory. It is China who is in illegal possession of our territory.

[Shri B. Satyanaranyan Reddy]

That point should be understood very clearly. Nothing has been said about it so far.

As regards our relations with Pakistan, we want friendly relations with them. A democratically-elected Government has come to power under the leadership of Miss Benazir Bhutto in Pakistan. (Interruptions). It has nothing to do with it. After the election results in Pakistan, we had great hopes that our two countries will again be as friendly as possible because these countries were one before partition. We expected to have friendly relations with them. We still expect that. But the recent pronouncements by Mrs. Benazir Bhutto are somewhat disturbing. I do not know whether it is due to the pressure of the old military guards who were in power during the regime of President Zia-ul-Haq. On the question of Siachen, on the question of Kashmir, some disturbing news are coming. We do not expect that side will follow the same policy which was adopted by Zia-ul-Haq. We want that friendly relations should prevail between the two countries. One of our hon. Members said, Mr. Vikal said that the whole of Kashmir belongs to India. Yes, the whole of Kashmir belongs to India. Somebody pointed out that the map has not shown correctly. Yes, it should be rectified. But still in practice, what is happening? One-third of Jammu and Kashmir is still in illegal possession of Pakistan That is hanging on our head. We do not know when it will be solved. Until and unless that problem is solved, relations will be strained between these two countries So, it is proper that the Pakistani authorities, whichever Government may be in power there, must understand this. And our Indian Government must also explain to the Pakistan Government that whatever territory is still in their illegal position, they must hand it over to India immediately and have best of friendly relations. So far this Tibet issue is concerned...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Are you not completing?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I am completing. The foreign issue...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): No, no. Mr. Reddy, you had only 12 minutes and you have exceeded 30 minutes.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I am concluding. Dalai Lama has made certain proposals. It is very important...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): Everything is important. You have to adjust to your time allotted. You are speaking in Parliament. You are not on a public platform.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Sir, our country has suffered a lot in the war with China in 1962 and in two wars with Pakistan. We do not want to take any such chances. We want peace on the borders. We want peace in the country. So, real issues are involved. This is the only occasion when we can express our views. So, I would only mention this and conclude. Sir, so far as Tibet is concerned, Dalai Lama has come as a refugee or whatever you call it and we have accepted rightly or wrongly that Tibet is a part of China. And sovereignty or suzerainty or whatever it is, that term has been used by the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Whether it is right or wrong, the actual position is that it is in the possession of China. But a large number of Tibetans are in our country as refugees. They are struggling. And we do not want them permanently in this country. They have to go to Tibet if not today, tomorrow. What are we doing? Nothing has been said. Nothing has been said about the proposals given by Dalai

Lama. When the Prime Minister visited China, nothing has been said about it. We do not know whether he has talked about it or not. Some of my friends were talking of Sikkim. Sikkim issue has not been discussed. So, these are the problems that have to be solved in order to have friendly relations, a peaceful atmosphere in the borders. Similarly, so far as Bangladesh is concerned, many refugees are coming. thousands of refugees are coming. How is it possible to have a peaceful atmosphere? So, these are some of the problems that have to be dealt with very seriously by this Government. And this President's Address has utterly failed to mention all these problems. And I urge upon the Government and the House that the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address that has been moved by my learned friend should be rejected, should be thrown out. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow, the 3rd March, 1989.

The House then adjourned at forty-five minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 3rd March, 1989.

M GIPMRND—RS—I 1854RS—3—7—89